JPRS-TAC-86-079

3 OCTOBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-079
3 OCTOBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Japan's Cabinet Ministers Discuss SDI Participation
(Tokyo KYODO, 2 Sep 86)..... 1

Japan Government Announces SDI Participation
(Tokyo KYODO, 9 Sep 86)..... 2

Kuranari Informs U.S: 2
Talks To Begin Soon 2
MITI To Set SDI Guidelines 3
Kuranari Questioned in Diet 4

Japan's Foreign Minister on SDI, Ties With USSR, PRC
(Tokyo KYODO, 30 Aug 86)..... 5

Japan's High-Tech Firms Supportive of SDI Decision
(Tokyo KYODO, 9 Sep 86)..... 7

Briefs
Japan Opposition Parties Denounce SDI Decision 8
Italy's SDI Participation 8

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRG Paper Says 1986 Summit Will Produce No Arms Agreement
(Jan Reifenberg; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, 5 Sep 86)..... 9

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Netherlands Defense Minister Opposed to More Nuclear Deployments
(Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 29 Aug 86)..... 12

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Soviet Academician Fokin on Threat From U.S. Binary Weapons
(A. Fokin; Moscow SOVETSKIY VOIN, No 10, May 86)..... 13

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Zimbabwe's NAM Summit Policy Statement on European Arms Control
(Belgrade TANJUG, 7 Sep 86)..... 18

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Radio Broadcast of 25 August Press Conference
(Moscow Domestic Service, 25 Aug 86)..... 19

USSR: Comments on Moratorium 3-16 September
(Various sources, various dates)..... 27

Hammer, Gale Cited 27
U.S. Propaganda 'Attack', by Spartak Beglov 28
Urgency Stressed, by Yuriy Bandura, Yuriy Buksin 29
U.S. 'Cave Mentality', by Vladimir Katin 34
Scientist Outlines Benefits, by Aleksandr Kalyadin 36
Finnish Politician Cited 39
'Disarmament Tango' Urged, by Leonid Ponomarev 40
'Lack of Political Will', by G. Dadyants 41
'Breakthrough Seen Possible', by Ye. Primakov 44
Weinberger View 'Absurd', by V. Gan 47
Defense Ministry Expert, V. L. Kotyuzhanskiy Interview 48
World Opinion Cited, by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov 51
'Daniloff Affair' Distracts From Offer, by Aleksandr Zholkver 53
U.S. Arguments Rebutted, by Vasiliy Morozov 53
Moscow Radio Talk Show, by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, et. al. 55
Foreign Journalists Round Table, by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, et. al. 57
Message to AFL-CIO 59
Summit Prospects 'Not Rosy', by Nikolay Shishlin 60
Defense Ministry Spokesman, A. F. Kuznetsov Interview 61
U.S. 'Politicking' Hit, by V. Falin 63

Soviet Army Paper Hits FRG's Woerner Remarks on Moratorium
(I. Voinov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Sep 86)..... 67

USSR: Kazakhstan Experiment Shows Moratorium Verifiable
(A. Borovik; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Sep 86)..... 69

USSR's Petrosyants Holds Geneva Press Conference on Moratorium
(Moscow TASS, 15 Sep 86)..... 73

Gorbachev Fields Questions on Test Moratorium
(Moscow Television Service, 17 Sep 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Sep 86)..... 74

17 September 74
18 September 75

TASS Cites U.S. Peace Group on Testing Program
(Moscow TASS, 8, 10 Sep 86)..... 77

4 Sep Test Information 77
Upcoming Tests 77
IZVESTIYA Observer's Comments 78

Moscow TV: 2 Sep Press Conference on Verification Techniques
(Moscow Television Service, 2 Sep 86)..... 79

PRAVDA Reports on Lugar South Pacific Trip
(Moscow PRAVDA, 2, 5 Sep 86)..... 86

'Anti-Nuclear Feelings in Region', by Aleksey Ivkin 86
New Zealand Ship Calls Policy, by O. Skalkin 87

Danish Parliamentarians, Soviet Officials Discuss Kola Peninsula
(Otto Brix; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 28 Aug 86)..... 88

CSSR: Semipalatinsk Team States No Nuclear Tests Held
(Prague CTK, 12 Sep 86)..... 89

Japan's Foreign Ministry Welcomes USSR Test Ban Extension
(Tokyo KYODO, 20 Aug 86)..... 90

RELATED ISSUES

Moscow Press Conference: Security, Test Ban, SDI
(Andrey Ptashnikov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 11 Sep 86)..... 91

Austria's Vranitzky Writes to Gorbachev on Arms Issues, SDI
(Kurt Seinitz; Vienna NEUE KRONEN ZEITUNG, 16 Aug 86)..... 95

FRG Disarmament Official Holds Talks With GDR's Fischer
(Hamburg DPA, 10 Sep 86)..... 96

USSR's Arbatov Explains New Security Policy
(Georgiy Arbatov Interview; Sofia TRUD, ? Sep 86)..... 97

Japan Reaffirms Non-Nuclear Policies to U.S.
(Tokyo KYODO, 16 Aug 86)..... 100

Japan: Planned 'New Jersey' Visit Sparks Controversy
(Tokyo NHK, 19 Aug 86)..... 101

Japan: 'New Jersey' Arrives for Port Call Amid Protests
(Tokyo KYODO, 24, 25 Aug 86)..... 102

Labor, Peace Activists Protest 102
'Calm' Returns 25 August 103

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN'S CABINET MINISTERS DISCUSS SDI PARTICIPATION

OW020537 Tokyo KYODO in English 0525 GMT 2 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 2 KYODO -- Cabinet ministers concerned with Japan's possible participation in the research phase of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), will reach a conclusion on the matter on Septemeber 9, government sources said Tuesday.

The ministers' confab, led by Chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda, revieved their past discussions in a fifth meeting Tuesday morning. They discussed whether Japan's participation in the SDI project would breach a 1969 Diet resolution over peaceful use of space. According to the sources, the Diet resolution is the biggest obstacle to Japan joining in research on SDI, a space-based antimissile system known as "star wars."

The ministers agreed that Japan's participation would not breach the Diet resolution because the project is being conducted by the U.S. The ministers also agreed that their September 9 meeting will finalize their report to be submitted to the cabinet.

Gotoda told reporters after the Tuesday meeting that the final decision is likely to be made within the first 10 days of this month. He added that he himself would announce the official decision.

In the Tuesday meeting the concerned ministers discussed how research might benefit Japan, Gotoda said. The United States will hold the final rights to any new technology developed in the SDI research, the ministers agreed. But they agreed that the result should be available to Japanese companies participating in the study, Gotoda said.

The ministers also concluded that their decision that SDI participation would not breach the Diet resolution must be explained to the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party through the Foreign Ministry. Gotoda said the ministers considered objections by opposition parties to Japan's joining SDI research. They will discuss the matter from "all considerable aspects" in the final meeting on next Tuesday, Gotoda added.

/8309
CSO: 5260/134

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCES SDI PARTICIPATION

Kuranari Informs U.S.

OW090937 Tokyo KYODO in English 0933 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari Tuesday sent a government statement on Japan's decision to start talks on participation in the U.S.-proposed strategic defense initiative (SDI) to U.S. Secretary George Shultz and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, a Foreign Ministry official said. The statement was approved by the Cabinet meeting earlier the same day. The SDI program, popularly called "star wars" plan, is a space-based defense system research project announced by U.S. President Ronald Reagan in 1983. Weinberger requested Japan to participate in the project in March last year.

Talks To Begin Soon

OW090055 Tokyo KYODO in English 0050 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Japan said Tuesday it will start talks with the United States to lay an overall framework for Japan's participation in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI), popularly known as the "star wars" project. In a statement released Tuesday, chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda said participation in the SDI research is in line with Japan's basic policy of seeking stable relations between the West and the East through a drastic cut in nuclear arms and the abolition of nuclear weapons.

The decision to participate was approved by the Cabinet in a meeting Tuesday morning. The government's decision will not violate a 1969 Diet resolution banning military exploitation of Japan's space development efforts, the statement said. The Japanese decision came after the government dispatched three missions to the U.S. to examine the program. The ministers concerned, under Gotoda's chairmanship, held a series of meetings which started last April to discuss the technology, strategy, and legal framework after the U.S. asked Japan to join the research.

U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who announced the project in 1983, told Japan early last year that the program is aimed at nullifying ballistic missiles with a non-nuclear defense system and seeks a total abolition of nuclear arms the statement said. The United States has asked 10 countries to participate in the SDI project. So far West Germany, Britain and Israel have accepted the request.

In a meeting with Reagan in January last year, Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone expressed "understanding" of the U.S. decision to go ahead with the SDI program but he stopped short of making any commitment about Japan's participation. In a report issued last April following the last fact-finding trip to the U.S., a joint government-private mission paved the way for the government decision, saying that participation could result in "enormous progress" in Japan's high technology.

The government statement Tuesday sought to stress the role of SDI as a strategic deterrent in East-West ties and a defense system to eliminate nuclear weapons. Nakasone has already confirmed with Reagan that the SDI program seeks no U.S. unilateral military superiority to the Soviet Union and is aimed at reducing offensive nuclear arms drastically, the statement said.

Reagan has also affirmed that the project will help maintain and strengthen deterrents in the West and that consultations with the U.S. allies and talks with the Soviet Union should be the precondition for the system to be developed and deployed, it said.

The government's talks with the U.S. will focus on setting up a government-to-government framework to smooth the path for the private sector's participation in the various SDI research programs. The government will not propose new legislation for the technological transfer and the protection of classified information on military technology. This will be left to the present domestic laws nd the Japan-U.S. agreement in the defense sector, the statement said. Participation in the research program would help improve Japan's technological standards and lead to further Japan-U.S. cooperation under the bilateral security treaty, it said.

MITI To Set SDI Guidelines

OW090751 Tokyo KYODO in English 0742 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) will map out guidelines to enable Japanese firms to better participate in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI), MITI officials said Tuesday. The officials said that such guidelines are needed because no Japanese firm has ever concluded a consignment contract with the U.S. Department of Defense.

The Japanese Government, which made the formal decision earlier Tuesday to participate in the SDI research, plans to pressure the U.S. to allow Japanese private firms to fully utilize the results of the research, the officials said. But MITI and other government agency officials speculated that SDI talks between the two countries will be tough, particularly on protection of industrial secrets and the rights by participating private firms to use the newly acquired technologies. Nevertheless, the officials agreed that the multibillion dollar project has the potential of producting advanced technological innovations.

Kuranari Questioned in Diet

OW090533 Tokyo KYODO in English 0449 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari said Tuesday Japan's participation in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) will not breach a 1969 Diet resolution banning military exploitation of Japan's space development efforts.

Responding to a question from a socialist Dietman in a House of Councillors Audit Committee session, Kuranari said the resolution called for "a peaceful use of space" when Japan develops and utilizes space. Kuranri said the SDI project, a space-based antimissile plan known as "star wars," will be developed by the United States, and the Diet resolution therefore does not apply to it.

Hiroaki Fujii, director general of the Foreign Ministry's North American Affairs Bureau, asked about U.S. research on x-ray lasers for use in connection with nuclear weapons, said the research is aimed at matching similar research being conducted by the Soviet Union. He said the SDI was aimed at producing a non-nuclear defensive system, and the x-ray laser research is only a part of the program.

/8309
CSO: 5260/137

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN'S FOREIGN MINISTER ON SDI, TIES WITH USSR, PRC

OW300527 Tokyo KYODO in English 0217 GMT 30 Aug 86

[Text] Karuizawa, Nagano Pref., Aug. 30 KYODO — The Japanese Government will decide by September 10 whether or not to participate in the Strategic Defense Initiative, Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari said Saturday.

Kuranari, speaking at a Liberal-Democratic Party seminar here, stopped short of saying whether they would decide participation in the project.

A cabinet task force has studied the matter for the past half year after the United States invited Japan and other Western allies to participate in the research phase of the antimissile program.

One major hurdle lies in a Diet resolution limiting Japan's space research efforts to peaceful use only. Kuranari said the government is probing ways on how to resolve the Diet resolution so that a decision on Japan's participation can be reached.

Kuranari said the government is also working on the issue of fingerprinting requirements for foreign residents in Japan, which he said is aggravating Japan's ties with South Korea. He said he expected the matter to improve, and that the justice minister is "positive" about taking appropriate steps to achieve this.

On Japan's ties with the Soviet Union, Kuranari said Japan welcomes Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's proposed visit to Japan, noting that the visit reflects Gorbachev's policy of attaching more importance to Asia in Soviet foreign policy. He said the Japanese Government is hopeful that the visit will produce substantial results, and cited Japan's claim to four Soviet-held islands off northern Japan as a major thorn in bilateral ties. Also, he said Japan has no intention of separating politics from economics in its ties with the Soviet Union, and added that Japan's claim of sovereignty of the four northern islands "is an issue which can't be averted."

Turning to Japan's ties with China, Kuranari cited the "Yasukuni Shrine" problem as a major irritant in otherwise smooth bilateral ties. While Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone's decision to avoid an official visit to the shrine August 15 has temporarily averted a confrontation with China, the issue will continue to haunt bilateral relations in the future, Kuranari said. The basic problem, he said, is that although the shrine is dedicated to the war dead, Japan's A-class war criminals are also enshrined there.

On Japan-U.S. ties, Kuranari warned that the Kansai airport project will turn into another aspect of trade friction with the United States if the project contracts are not open to American firms.

On Japan's ties with Southeast Asia, Kuranari proposed that Japan accept more students from the region as part of Japanese efforts to build closer ties with the region.

Overall, Kuranari advocated a more active part in foreign policy, saying that Japan should play a role that is more compatible with its economic strength in the world.

/8309
CSO: 5260/133

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN'S HIGH-TECH FIRMS SUPPORTIVE OF SDI DECISION

OW090723 Tokyo KYODO in English 0658 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Japan's major high tech firms welcomed the government's decision Tuesday to participate in the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) but stopped short of immediately committing themselves to the multibillion dollar project.

Toshiba Corp., a leading electronics manufacturer, said in a statement that it has a strong interest in possible spin-offs from SDI and its potential for upgrading of technology. "We as a maker of general electrical products believe we hold the technological potential to participate in many of the fields subject to the SDI research," the statement said. "The most crucial issue for private corporations is how to utilize the results of the SDI research," Toshiba said. Toshiba was one of the 21 Japanese firms whose engineers went on a fact-finding mission to the United States last spring.

Hitachi Ltd., which also sent an engineer to America as part of the investigative mission, said it will closely follow government-level consultations between the two countries on the type of participation and the right to use results of research.

Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd., Japan's biggest heavy machinery concern and the flagship of the giant Mitsubishi group, also said it expects the SDI research to produce many spin-offs. A Mitsubishi heavy industry engineer was also on the last SDI mission, which included nine government officials.

During their stay in the U.S. from March 31 to April 8, members of the delegation visited the Pentagon, the Los Alamos national laboratory, the U.S. Army's strategic defense command, Lockheed Missiles and Space Corp. and other places, depending on their fields of concern — directed energy weapons (DEW), kinetic energy weapons (KEW) and surveillance acquisition tracking kill-assessment (SATKA).

Government sources said the U.S. is seeking Japan's technological assistance in the fields of optoelectronics and millimeter wave and related technologies in the five-year, 26 billion dollar research phase of the project. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries said Japan's participation in the SDI research is extremely significant in that massive investment in a wide variety of high tech fields and an assortment of talents will be brought together.

Yataro Mitsubayashi, director general of the Science and Technology Agency, noted that the government put national interest ahead of other issues in reaching the decision to start talks with the United States on the SDI research.

/8309
CSO: 5260/138

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

JAPAN OPPOSITION PARTIES DENOUNCE SDI DECISION--Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO--Opposition parties denounced the government Tuesday for its decision to participate in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) program. The Japan Socialist Party said it opposes Japan's participation in SDI, which it said will breach not only a 1969 Diet resolution on the peaceful use of space but also the war-renouncing provisions of the constitution. The top opposition party demanded that the government retract the decision. Komeito said there are fears that the SDI program, to develop a space-based antimissile system, will put nuclear weapons in space and criticized the government decision for contravening Japan's long-established peace principles. The Japan Communist Party also blasted the decision, which it said was designed to extend the U.S. nuclear arms into space. It demanded that the government retract the decision. The government announcement also brought mixed reactions from Japanese scientists and researchers. A group of physicists is staging a signature-collecting campaign against the SDI program, while some scientists and researchers regard the prospect of SDI research as an opportunity to work on technical innovations. [Text] [Tokyo KYODO in English 0613 GMT 9 Sep 86] /8309

ITALY'S SDI PARTICIPATION--The agreement between Italy and the United States on the participation of important Italian firms in the implementation of SDI has been confirmed. The official document between the two governments will be signed next week. The firms concerned are SNIA BPD [expansion unknown], Comau and Telettra of the Fiat group; Selenia and Aeritalia from the IRI group [Industrial Reconstruction Institute]; and Danileo from the (Ettim) group. These branches of industry are highly sophisticated in electronics and arms technology. The United States may invest nearly $14 billion in Italy. Washington has already reached similar agreements with the FRG and England and will soon sign documents with Japan. The Italian Communists and the radicals have asked for a parliamentary debate to discuss the Italian-U.S. agreement. [Text] [Rome International Service in Italian 1555 GMT 11 Sep 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2768

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRG PAPER SAYS 1986 SUMMIT WILL PRODUCE NO ARMS AGREEMENT

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 5 Sep 86 p 12

[Article by Jan Reifenberg: "Poker Game Prior to Second Summit"]

[Text] Brussels, 4 September--The United States and the Soviet Union are raising the ante in their poker game about the date for a second summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev--but it is safe to say that it will take place in Washington, probably before the end of the year. Both sides are interested in continuing the dialogue at the highest level. But a comprehensive agreement on arms limitations does not seem to be in the cards. There is not enough time to overcome the basic differences of opinion--particularly with regard to the crucial matter of verification. Nonetheless, it does appear possible that the two heads of government will issue a statement of guidelines for their respective experts to follow in working out a subsequent agreement on deep cuts in strategic weapons and a gradual transition from the present strategy of simple deterrence to one of defense. In addition, agreements on intermediate range and short-range weapons and, in case of a positive conclusion of the Stockholm conference, on procedures for spelling out guidelines for the "confidence-building measures" sought at that conference, in Vienna and within the CSCE framework may be reached. There may also be some bilateral agreements, e.g. on establishment of "risk prevention centers" in Washington and Moscow.

NATO circles point out that the number and scope of Soviet-American and multilateral negotiations--from Vienna to Stockholm--has attained unprecedented density. The Moscow meeting at which Soviet and American representatives are discussing the reduction of strategic weapons and future defense systems in space will be followed by a round of talks in Washington this weekend which will also deal with the status of the Vienna MBFR conference. In Geneva, negotiations on on a nuclear test ban are continuing and in Berne, bilateral talks about a ban on chemical weapons are going on. Talks on regional issues are also continuing, albeit without having reached a meeting of the minds. By the time of the Shultz-Shevarnadze meeting in Washington on 19 and 20 September, at any rate, the groundwork should have been laid for the establishment of a loose agenda for the second summit.

Alliance circles also point out that Gorbachev's proposals which indicated a readiness on his part to engage in more flexible negotiations, have been answered both in Reagan's letter of 25 July (to which there has been no Soviet reponse thus far) and in suggestions submitted to the Soviets in Geneva, Moscow and Washington. What appears important most of all is that the Americans are now ready to go beyond the previous upper limits on strategic weapons on land, on the sea and in the air in order to meet the Soviet proposals at least halfway. Thus, the United States is now offering a total increase of intercontinental warheads by about 25 to 7,500 while allowing for an increase of the warheads on Soviet land-based intercontinental missiles by 10 percent to a total of 3,300. The American side is also prepared to accept land-based mobile long-range weapons as well as an increase in aircraft-borne cruise missiles from 1,500 to 2,000. Reagan is also said to have proposed in his letter that negotiations be held on a total reduction of all long-range missiles and on joint research on missile defense systems of the future. This is tantamount to a seven and one-half year delay of the (by no means certain) start of the deployment of the initial components of the space defense system. A precondition, however, would be a revision of the 1972 ABM agreement on limiting mutual missile defense systems.

Alliance experts therefore believe that there is enough of a basis for the achievement of the "concrete results" which Gorbachev cited as a condition for a second summit meeting with Reagan. They say that progress is possible particularly with regard to those issues which are of immediate concern to Europe--provided that satisfactory formulas for verification can be found. But if the two sides should stick to their original positions on this issue, the summit might well be jeopardized. Only if the two superpowers are ready for a compromise is there a chance that it will be held. But the decision on this continues to be a political one. It cannot be reached by the military men who are always concerned with preserving their own achievements and are loath to give up any of the weapons systems they have fought hard to get. But both Reagan and Gorbachev must also take economic factors into account; they dare not place domestic stability in jeopardy. The American Congress has placed limitations on Reagan in its budget debate, cutting the budget requests for SDI drastically. A majority in the House has called for compliance with the upper limits set by SALT-II and for limiting underground nuclear testing to one-kiloton weapons. The figures regarding the huge American foreign trade deficit speak for themselves. A reduction in the steadily growing national debt is not in sight. All this seems to indicate that the SDI dream may at best lead to a new type of missile defense to protect a country's own bases but that it will not serve as the perfect defense shield for a country's population in the foreseeable future. The Reagan arms program has reached its zenith. The question is whether the President will now play the trumps he has acquired or whether he will make a political decision as between the concerns of the Pentagon and its chief, Caspar Weinberger, and the proposals for negotiations by his Secretary of State--as he did prior to the first meeting with Gorbachev in Geneva.

East European experts say that Gorbachev has a foreign trade crisis of his own to contend with which is due to the collapse of oil prices and the resultant hard currency shortage. Even a superficial look at the relevant figures makes it clear that the general secretary needs an arms limitation agreement with the United States if he wishes to modernize the Soviet economy. That, then, is the explanation for the Soviet hints of greater readiness for compromise with respect to inspection and verification of agreements. Their constant insistence on the conclusion of a general agreement on banning nuclear tests is an indication of their concern about a technological setback vis-a-vis the United States in the development of missile defense systems of the future. Their insistence on SALT-II and the ABM Treaty, in spite of their violation of both agreements, is an indication of this. East European experts are asking themselves whether Gorbachev and his ideas along these lines will be able to prevail with the Moscow party and government apparatus or whether he is still engaged in trying to consolidate his power. Experience has shown that this can turn out to be a lengthy process. Which is why Gorbachev will have to walk a thin line with Reagan at their second summit--with his suspicious military men and the old-line party ideologues looking on. In the end, a great deal will depend on how the Soviet Union's American experts describe the advantages of an agreement with Reagan in the latter's next-to-last year in office to him and in particular how binding such an agreement will be on the President's successor and whether it will provide the desired breathing spell for Moscow. And as for Ronald Reagan, time is rapidly running out on his desire to achieve a first agreement on arms reduction and to be remembered by posterity as a successful peace President.

9478
CSO: 5200/2760

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NETHERLANDS DEFENSE MINISTER OPPOSED TO MORE NUCLEAR DEPLOYMENTS

PM031006 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 29 Aug 86 p 3

[Correspondent's report: "Van Eekelen Is Against More Nuclear Warheads in the Netherlands]

[Excerpt] The Hague — Defense Minister Van Eekelen considers that the Netherlands already makes a reasonable contribution to the stockpiling of NATO nuclear warheads. For this reason he sees no reason to stockpile more warheads in the Netherlands in a redistribution among the European nations.

This was announced by the Defense Ministry yesterday in a reaction to the plan of NATO supreme commander General Rogers to move half of the nuclear warheads currently stockpiled in West Germany.

According to Rogers, too large a proportion of NATO's nuclear warheads is to be found in the FRG.

He wants primarily to distribute the surplus among the southern European nations in NATO.

In the past NATO has indicated several times that the Netherlands also has too few of the alliance's nuclear warheads.

Van Eekelen agrees with Rogers that the vulnerability of the nuclear weapons in Western Europe must be reduced.

That is why the Netherlands Government decided to nuclearize its 8-inch guns in West Germany, the minister said.

He also pointed out that the supreme commander's proposal, made in the German magazine *Stern*, has not yet been discussed in the NATO Nuclear Planning Group. [passage omitted]

/8309
CSO: 5200/2770

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN FOKIN ON THREAT FROM U.S. BINARY WEAPONS

Moscow SOVETSKIY VOIN in Russian No 10, May 86 pp 46-47

[Article by Academician A. Fokin, president of the All-Union Chemical Society imeni D. I. Mendeleyev: "The Binary Turn of the Arms Race"]

[Text] At the beginning of the current year, the U.S. House of Representatives followed the senate in approving a bill allocating large appropriations to the production of binary chemical ammunition containing nerve agents. Munitions of this type, just like the rest of the U.S. chemical arsenal, are typical offensive weapons of mass destruction. The steps being taken by Washington with regard to binary weapons are a logical continuation of the militaristic course of the U.S.A., which is designed to achieve military superiority.

Following tests of nuclear weapons and a test of the ASAT antisatellite system, the American administration is proceeding to large-scale production of a variety of qualitatively new, death-dealing chemical weapons. Thus, a new step is being taken in the arms race which is intensifying the military threat and heightening international tension. This decision caused serious concern in scientific circles, among the progressive public in our country, and among all decent people of the world.

Just what are the binary chemical weapons of the U.S.A.? Known chemical compounds such as Sarin and Soman for example, and other lethal organophosphoric compounds, are used in them in a new way; in new types of shell fillings. Binary ammunition is distinguished from existing unitary rounds of ammunition in that it is equipped with two components. Capsules, each of which contains one component, are placed in a steel container. One or several containers are used to fill an artillery shell. After the shell is fired, the walls of the capsules, which are made of a polymer material, break down during the shell's flight and a mixing of components occurs, causing a reaction that leads to

the formation of a highly toxic substance. Where rockets are concerned, two initial components are mixed with the aid of a propeller that begins to spin after the rocket is launched toward the target and the partitions have been destroyed. Thus, the synthesis of the chemical agent is accomplished in the round of ammunition itself during its time of flight to the target.

The foreign press notes that the components of binary shells may be substances that are non-toxic or of slight toxicity. They can be stored or transported separately. This will introduce great difficulties for control in the event that a convention prohibiting chemical weapons is adopted.

The idea that it would be possible to obtain a needed chemical agent, the storage of which presents a risk to one's own troops, by means of combining two comparatively harmless initial products, is not new. Thus, in 1909 the use of the binary principle was proposed for the storage and employment of nitroglycerine. Later, during the Second World War, the U.S.A. and its satellites discussed the use of high explosives and some chemical agents (for example: a mixture of sodium arsenide and sulfuric acid, which forms arsine). These types of binary ammunition were tested under field conditions, but played no appreciable role at that time due to technical defects.

Broad development of binary chemical weapons began in 1954, when military chemists of the U.S. sought a means of producing medium bombs containing the nerve agent Sarin and large bombs of the Big Eye type for the new organophosphoric agent, VX. As a result of the research conducted, 155-mm artillery shells for the delivery of binary chemical agents (under the code name "XM 687") have appeared in the U.S. armed forces since 1972. Since 1971, the Pentagon has devoted 50 percent of its expenditures on chemical weapons to the creation of binary types of ammunition.

In June of 1980, the House of Representatives, without discussion, approved the appropriation of funds for the construction of a new plant for the manufacture of binary chemical weapons in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

In 1982, the American administration announced a new program of so-called chemical rearmament and reinforced it with an allocation of large sums for the manufacture of materials for waging chemical warfare. The chief of the White House [as published] announced a decision to proceed to large-scale production of chemical agents, including binary ammunition. This decision was the beginning of a broad program of development of chemical

weapons in the U.S., expenditures on which will comprise about 10 billion dollars over a ten-year period. As a result of this program, America's arsenal of chemical weapons will be significantly expanded. The implementation of the program of "large-scale outfitting" of the U.S. Army with a new generation of chemical weapons, weapons that are binary, will lead to almost a doubling of stocks of this "noiseless" weapon of death in the U.S. arsenal; from 3 million to 5 million rounds of chemical ammunition. A plant has already been built in the city of Pine Bluff that is designed to manufacture 70 thousand rounds of binary ammunition per year (artillery shells and bombs) and it is ready to begin production.

The plant in Pine Bluff is just the first [plant] intended for the production of new, binary ammunition. It is known that there are more than ten modern plants in moth balls in the U.S. with a production capacity of tens of thousands of tons of chemical substances and ammunition per year, which could be brought into operation at any time.

Binary chemical warfare weapons are earmarked by the Pentagon's leadership exclusively for the extermination of troops and the civilian population. Material valuables will remain practically untouched by their use. These weapons are dangerous also because they give one the capability, by varying the initial components, to obtain new types of chemical agents with regard to which the organization of defense and detection and treatment will be more difficult.

The American binary program will cause particular danger to Europe. Washington does not conceal the fact that it plans to store binary weapons in Western European countries: in the FRG, England, Italy and Turkey. This threatens to turn Europe into the main theater of chemical war; a war in which the principal casualty would be the civilian population. According to the evidence of foreign experts, in the event that binary weapons are employed, civilian casualties in Europe will be twenty to thirty times greater than military casualties. It's worth bearing in mind that already, right now, every tenth shell, mine and bomb of the U.S. chemical arsenal is to be found in the European military bases of the U.S. Most of them are in dumps in the FRG, but they are also stored in England and Italy. Thus, Western Europe is becoming a double hostage of the Pentagon; first in a nuclear war and now in a chemical war.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger at one time declared that the U.S. should constantly threaten the Soviet Union with the use of chemical weapons and should consider the advisability of their use in any military conflict. That is to say, in

essence the military specialists of the U.S. think that chemical warfare should be viewed as an integral part of military operations. What is more, in their opinion chemical weapons will become the primary weapons in the conduct of combat operations, where nuclear weapons are not used.

Along with this, the strategic military concepts of NATO also envision "integrated use of conventional, nuclear and chemical weapons and electronic equipment in war." In chemical munitions, the main bet is being placed on binary chemical weapons. It is well to recall the statement of the commander-in-chief of NATO Joint Forces in Europe, General Bernard Rogers, concerning the fact that it is precisely on the European continent that binary weapons will be used along with nuclear weapons from the very start of combat operations.

The relative simplicity of manufacture of components of binary chemical weapons can lead to their proliferation. And this is under conditions where at the present time there is no treaty or agreement of any kind concerning the non-proliferation of chemical weapons. There is also no ban on their manufacture in countries that do not have this weapon.

Therefore, the development of binary technology in the U.S. and the deployment of such weapons will undoubtedly be conducive to the removal of the last barriers blocking the manufacture of chemical weapons by the reactionary regimes of some countries. The growing danger may be halted only by the conclusion of an international treaty prohibiting the production, storage and use of this type of weapon. Attempting to justify, if only a little, its barbaric preparations in the eyes of world opinion, military circles of the U.S. are spreading assertions that the USSR considers chemical warfare as a feasible version of war. In reality, our country has never used chemical weapons anywhere and has always spoken out against their use and continues to do so.

The Soviet Union has always stood resolutely and consistently for a general prohibition of chemical weapons, for their complete removal from the arsenals of states and for the effective destruction of stores of them. The position of the Soviet Union is as clear as clear can be: There is no place on earth for chemical weapons. Their production, acquisition and storage should be prohibited and existing stockpiles destroyed. The prohibition of binary weapons should be a step on the road to total prohibition of chemical weapons.

This position was confirmed at the 27th CPSU Congress in the Political Report of the Party Central Committee, where it is emphasized that the creation of a comprehensive system of

international security requires, in particular, a ban on chemical weapons and their destruction, and renunciation of the creation of other means of mass extermination.

It's worth recalling that in the joint Soviet-American declaration made on the results of the meeting in Geneva from 19 to 21 November 1985 of comrade M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and R. Reagan, president of the U.S.A.; it says: "In the context of discussion of problems of security, the parties affirmed that they support a full and general prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stocks of such weapons. To that end, they agreed to step up efforts to conclude an international agreement that is effective and subject to control."

In light of this, is it possible to hope that common sense will in the end gain the upper hand over the imperial ways of the White House? Time will give an answer to this question. The world is waiting not just for correct declarations from the American administration, but for practical action in corroboration of them. To be delivered from the threat of lethal chemical weapons is in the interests of both the European peoples and the whole of humanity. It is impossible to put an end to this threat while creating new, binary forms of it, just as it is impossible to put an end to the nuclear threat while creating space strike weapons. To realize this, means to provide a most important condition for the strenthening of international security.

COPYRIGHT: "Sovetskiy voin", 1986.

12784
CSO: 1801/228

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

ZIMBABWE'S NAM SUMMIT POLICY STATEMENT ON EUROPEAN ARMS CONTROL

LD071220 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0215 GMT 7 Sep 86

["Final Declaration: Europe"--TANJUG headline]

[Text] Harare, September 6 (TANJUG) — The non-aligned at their eighth summit in Harare welcomed the resumption of the discussions between USSR and USA on the reduction or elimination of medium range nuclear missiles deployed on the European Continent. They assessed that, if successful, these negotiations could constitute a historical turn in arresting the nuclear arms race and possibly reversing it.

The heads of state or government also expressed the hope that the forthcoming Vienna session of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) would reaffirm and strengthen the positive trends initiated by the Helsinki Conference. They noted that the non-aligned and neutral countries of Europe play an important and constructive role in the relaxation of East-West tension. This role is complementary to the global efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement and constitute concrete implementation of the principles and policies of non-alignement in Europe - say the non-aligned in their final summit declaration.

As Europe is the continent with the highest concentration of military arsenals and the most marked division of states into rival blocks the heads of state or government of the non-aligned welcomed the efforts for the relaxation of tension in Europe. At the same time they stressed the close inter-dependence between the security of Europe and the security of the Mediterranean and the fact that confidence building measures in Europe should be extended to cover the Mediterranean region.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW RADIO BROADCAST OF 25 AUGUST PRESS CONFERENCE

LD251944 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 25 Aug 86

[Report by special correspondent Yevgeniy Grachev on 25 August USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press conference conducted by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs; Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces; and Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs]

[Text] [Grachev] The spacious hall at the Press Center is full to capacity. Hundreds of journalists, both Soviet and foreign, representing the media of many states of the world, have assembled here. There are more than a dozen TV, cinema and photo lenses alone trained on the participants in the press conference. The journalists' interest is explained by the theme of the press conference: For in the current international situation it is difficult--rather, it is impossible to get away from the question--to be or not to be; will the earth continue to remain the cradle of humankind, or will it become a lifeless desert, burned up in a nuclear blaze? There is no one indifferent to this main question. Here is what was said by Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov speaking at the press conference.

[Begin Vorontsov recording] The statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 18 August of this year on one of the key problems in international politics--the ending of nuclear tests and the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987, stands, it can be said without exaggeration, at the center of the world's attention.

The overwhelming majority of governments and of political and public figures, and ordinary people in all countries express themselves decisively in favor of an urgent end to nuclear explosions. In opposition to them are a mere small but stubborn and influential group of persons in the United States who are in support of nuclear explosions continuing to shake our planet. A noticeable nervousness prevails now in Washington; contradictory arguments are made in favor of the United States continuing nuclear explosions. Here are a few examples: The White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan speaks about the United States supposedly not being against a treaty on a comprehensive and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, but it

cannot, so he says, accept it without an appropriate monitoring system. Other representatives of the President of the United States reject the monitoring thesis and say bluntly that the United States needs the tests to improve its nuclear weapons. Washington has also muddled its arguments as to who is catching up with whom in the nuclear arms sphere. So essentially, the United States has no rational explanations as to why it does not want to join the Soviet moratorium, if it will not be acknowledged that the nuclear explosions are needed by the United States exclusively for continuing the nuclear arms race in a vain attempt to achieve military superiority. And of course, the matter does not lie in monitoring. The Soviet Union has in essence proposed all sorts of monitoring, even, in our opinion, sometimes over and above requirements. And the United States all the same will not take up halting nuclear tests. As is now clear to all, Washington is here hardly moved by concern over monitoring but an attempt to create a cover in order to continue to carry out work for creating new classes and types of nuclear weapons.

[Vorontsov continues] Of late, this has been the objective too, of the preparations for using the energy of a nuclear explosion for the implementation of the star wars program. I can state with all responsibility that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the problem of monitoring the ending of nuclear tests does not exist. This may be clearly seen if only by the example of the joint Soviet-American experiment on monitoring which was conducted by American and Soviet scientists in the Semipalatinsk area. The accord on this experiment was supported by the Soviet government which expressed its readiness to contribute in full to its implementation on our territory. The American Administration is still not demonstrating the same readiness in regard to the parallel execution of the same experiment on monitoring on American territory.

The Soviet Union highly appraises the joint work of the heads of state and governments of the six states--the "Delihi Six": Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania--toward the earliest possible cessation of nuclear explosions. We have already expressed our readiness to utilize the proposal of the "Delhi Six" on rendering assistance to the monitoring of the ending of nuclear tests, including on-site inspection, naturally, if this is also adopted by the other side, the United States. We have also expressed a positive attitude to the proposal to organize a meeting of experts of these six countries with Soviet and American experts, which was mentioned in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reply to the heads of state and governments of the six countries, published today.

There is every basis now for ending the nuclear fever on earth once and for all by means of a Soviet-American moratorium, and subsequently, a treaty. For the question of a moratorium, should be examined not in isolation, and not only as a measure toward ending nuclear explosions, but in the context of the overall problem, that of delivering mankind from nuclear weapons, as a kind of prologue to complete nuclear disarmament.

The ending of nuclear explosions is capable, to put it figuratively, of serving as one of the threads which, once pulled, would make it possible to start unwinding the whole complex tangle of the problem of nuclear disarmament. If there are no such explosions then new nuclear weapons will not be developed [sozdavatasya], and serious limitations will be created for those which already exist. And this will apply inequal measure to both the United States and the Soviet Union.

I would like to hope that in the final analysis common sense will still prevail in Washington, and that an historic opportunity on the path toward ending the arms race will not be missed.

We repeat once again that reaching an agreement with the United States on ending nuclear tests, with full monitoring, including on-site inspection, is possible, and quickly, too. Such an agreement could be signed at the Soviet-American summit which, as has been stated more than once by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is possible if the right political atmosphere is created for it, and if its success is ensured. [end recording]

[Grachev] The interest of journalists was naturally raised by that part of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement which stated that the USSR would not permit military superiority to be achieved over it, and that America's "Star Wars" program would be devalued by corresponding measures. Marshal Akhromeyev replied to these questions.

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] When they talk about the United States' preparations for "Star Wars," then what is meant is their preparation for the deployment of a multi-stage system of anti-missile defense for the territory of the United States, and for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of strike space weapons. The purpose of the U.S. preparation for "Star Wars," that is the implementation of what I have said, is to devalue the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union, that is to disarm the USSR and thus provide the United States of America with the opportunity to permanently threaten the Soviet Union with a mass nuclear missile strike.

[Akhromeyev continues] And two aspects are being pursued, and there are two aspects here: On the political level, that the deployment of the anti-missile defense system of the country and space-strike weapons undermines the existing balance and leads the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms into a dead end. It undermines faith in the realistic nature of these talks. It creates instead of stability a strategic chaos and sharply increases the risk of nuclear war.

On a purely military level, this program undermines the existing military balance. If the United States continues work to implement its Star Wars plans, the Soviet Union will have to take appropriate measures, and if necessary we shall quickly find an answer; moreover, this will not be the one

the United States expects it to be. It will be an answer that will invalidate the Star Wars program. This was clearly stated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the party, in his statement. As a military man, I can say that the United States does not possess a monopoly of scientific-technical progress in military matters. The development of science and technology in the military-technology field has reached a level where the eternal struggle between the sword and the shield, between defensive and offensive weapons, is today being solved not in one, but in several directions. For every action, a reliable means of counteraction can be found. In response to the action by the United States in undermining the balance with the help of the creation of the country's anti-missile defense and space-strike weapons, the Soviet Union could undertake an identical answer. It is in the position to do this. Strategic offensive weapons, too, can be perfected to such an extent as to make the program for the anti-missile defense of U.S. territory a fabulously expensive and extremely difficult matter to accomplish.

Other answers which will invalidate the Star Wars program are possible, too. In this situation, the Soviet Union is forced to carry out fundamental research in many directions. Among them are those who foresee with a fair amount of confidence effective measures for counteracting the anti-missile defense of the country's territory. Moreover, these measures can be implemented promptly. If the United States does indeed deploy its in-depth system of anti-missile defense of the country and space-strike weapons, the Soviet Union will select those methods of action which to the utmost extent meet the interests of its defense capabilities and in its turn will confront the United States with the need to seek an answer to this. Our measures will not be those toward which Washington would like to include us. [end recording]

[Grachev] The correspondent of Finnish television drew the attention of those taking part in the press conference to the fact that Washington at the present time is talking a lot about the fact that United States is allegedly lagging behind the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear arms, and that it is thus essential for the Americans to continue their nuclear tests.

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] Unfortunately, I have to state that the United States is not lagging behind the Soviet Union in nuclear tests. Such statements are not in accordance with reality. The facts say something else. At the present time, the United States is the leader in nuclear tests.

If one takes all the nucelar tests by all countries carried out over the whole of time, then the United States has carried out over 50 percent of nuclear tests out of the overall number carried out by all countries. Furtheremore, in each sphere taken separately, be it in the air, underground, or under water, the United States has conducted more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union.

If one takes the last 2 years, then in 1984 the United States and the Soviet Union carried out approximately the same number of nuclear tests. In 1985, prior to the moratorium the Soviet Union conducted nine while the United States carried out 20. This year, as everyone knows, since 1 August 1985, that is for over a year, the Soviet Union has not been carrying out nuclear tests, while the United States has carried out 18 nuclear tests since the moratorium began.

Those are the facts. Where then can there be any question of lagging behind? It is true that in such cases there is always talks about how the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in this area, although when it benefits the United States or the people who advocate this point of view, then, on the contrary, they say that the Soviet Union is overall immeasurably behind the United States. But in this case, the minute that it is advantageous, they say no, the United States is lagging behind the Soviet Union.

That is not the point. The point is that if nuclear tests are stopped, then no anti-missile defense can be set up for the country, space-strike weapons cannot be created and cannot be developed--in any case, not on a full scale and not to full strength in the way the United States understands it, as the United States intended.

[Akhromeyev continues] The point is this: The point has nothing to do with lagging behind, but the desire to modernize and completely renew strategic nuclear forces. For that, new warheads are needed. There is also the desire to develop the country's antimissile defense, and for that, nuclear power sources are needed. The United States therefore is opposed to banning nuclear tests. [end recording]

[Grachev] Developing the idea that the Soviet Union is constantly increasing its efforts in the struggle for peace and for the strengthening of trust and cooperation between people, it nonetheless has no intention of waiving principles of security, either those of its own security or of its friends, Comrade Akhromeyev continued:

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] The question of stopping nuclear tests has two sides. It has both the political and the military sides. From the political viewpoint, the question is for peaceloving states and the world public to achieve a ban on nuclear tests through their joint efforts. In answering an earlier question, I already said that in this case, in essence there will be a prohibition on the further development of nuclear weapons that is on the creation of new weapons systems. In that case, the deployment of strike space weapons and of the country's antimissile defense--that is the SDI as they call it in the United States or as it is now habitually called everywhere--will be seriously impeded, if not made impossible.

It is natural that the Soviet Union as a peaceloving state has an interest in this. In announcing the moratorium, it calculates that peaceloving states and the world public will support it in this matter.

The military side is really...[Akhromeyev changes thought] well this is a matter of no mean seriousness: we know who we are dealing with and we have no small amount of experience but, in the given instance we are all together in the Soviet Union: Both the political leadership and the military leadership see this matter in a comprehensive way, and although it is not simple for us and we must make a very careful assessment of the correlation of forces, and the correlation in the area of nuclear tests. We consider that as yet it is tolerable to accept a certain degree of detriment. [sentence as heard]

The country's defense capability is being maintained; both as far as our country and as far as our friends and allies are concerned, it is being maintained at an appropriate level. [end recording]

[Grachev] Numerous questions were linked with the problem of monitoring, about which Comrade Vorontsov had this to say:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] At the present time, given today's technical possibilities, we set no frontiers or limits to monitoring. I already have had an opportunity to say this at the beginning. We agree with the types of monitoring currently in existence. What will happen in a year's time is not known, but as for the present types of monitoring, we agree to them; namely, to making full use of all the national technical resources at the disposal of not only the Soviet Union and the United States, but also of other states. In this regard, the Delhi Six proposals are also valuable: They propose to put their technical resources at the service of monitoring and we agree to this idea.

We agree to international verification, including participation in this verification by any countries that will be ready to join in. Finally, we are also ready for on-site inspections being carried out. How is all this to be implemented concretely? Our specialists--together with the U.S. ones and, naturally, the Delhi Six--can take their places at the same negotiating table and I am confident that given the large quantity of materials already accumulated; given the research material on monitoring already at hand from the previous talks; given the eixstence of such a base, I think that concrete monitoring measures can be worked out literally during the course of 1 of 1 and 1/2 months.

[Grachev] It is maintained in Washington that the carrying out of nuclear explosions is determined by the necessity of verifying the combat readiness of nuclear warheads. Here is Marshal Akrhomeyev's view:

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] I must say that, on the whole and to some extent, this does correspond to reality: A proportion of nuclear tests being carried out by both sides is carried out by them for the purposes of

verifying already existing nuclear devices and for the purpose of determining the extent to which they are reliable. This proportion, however, is immeasurably small. Let us put it this way: Approximately 80 percent of nuclear tests and possibly more are carried out for the purpose of testing new nuclear devices that are destined for new nuclear arms being manufactured or for energy sources for space, in order to deploy offensive nuclear arms there. But then the USSR does, after all, propose to halt nuclear tests mutually. This means that the USSR halts them and the United States halts them. This means that neither our nuclear weapons, nor United States nuclear weapons will undergo reliability tests. After all, we thus place the sides in the same conditions. That is why it is not this--and I repeat again--it is not this that constitutes the main cause; the main cause is the desire to create more and more new nuclear arms systems. [end recording]

[Grachev] A large group of questions was connected with the reaction in various countries of the world to the Soviet leadership's statement:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] Judging by all, there are differences between Washington, other NATO capitals, and the capitals of other states that do not belong to military alliances.

Unfortunately, a militarized mode of thinking still has the upper hand in Washington; a mode of thinking that belongs to the past, a mode of thinking of people who have no wish to look into the future, not even the nearest future. What does it bode for us if the mountains of arms continue to grow ever higher? In the European countries, which are United States' allies, there are differences. There are sober-minded views that are being heard, already now.

Then there are appeals being made to Washington to take a new approach to this whole problem, which is complex and important for the world's future. Third, there is the attitude to this in many, many other world capitals: I believe I will not be guilty of an untruth if I say that in the Third World countries, I have not heard a single voice calling for nuclear tests to be continued, or even for the arms race to be continued. As I see it, in those countries peoples and governments are unanimous that it is time to halt this race, to embark on halting this race. This needs to be done now, not put off until tomorrow or until next year, but done now. That is how the range of feelings in the world now stands. [end recording]

[Grachev] Naturally, the United States' allies are following in the wake of White House policies, and the form of the questions at the press conference revealed concern on the part of the journalists over the position taken by ruling circles in NATO countries, first of all in Britain. Describing the reaction among the United States' allies, Comrade Vorontsov said:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] The fact is that out of all the Western European countries, Britain is, in effect, the one that most plainly has supported

Washington's--let us cautiously call it--rather strange position. I would not identify this support with British public opinion. For instance, not long ago I came upon a very interesting statement by the quite well respected London paper THE OBSERVER, which said forthrightly that the U.S. President is convinced that he will get more from continuing tests than from halting them, and British Prime Minister Thatcher goes along with him on this. But, their position is erroneous, THE OBSERVER writes: Sooner or later testing has to be halted if one is to aim to completely stop the present senseless arms race. So why not do this now? A very sensible question. [end recording]

[Grachev] Many other questions were asked at the press center and an exhaustive reply was given to each one.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: COMMENTS ON MORATORIUM 3-16 SEPTEMBER

Hammer, Gale Cited

PM110323 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Unnamed TASS Correspondent report under the general headline "Real Path to Disarmament": "A. Hammer-R. Gale: Developing Cooperation" — capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] "I CONSIDER IT MY MOST IMPORTANT MISSION IN LIFE TO HELP BUILD BRIDGES OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN OUR COUNTRIES IN THE NAME OF PEACE" — Armand Hammer, chairman of the board of America's Occidental Petroleum, stated in an interview with your TASS correspondent. He is visiting Odessa for the opening 1 September of an exhibition of paintings entitled "Five Centuries of Masterpieces" from his collection, including 120 works by Rembrandt, Michelangelo, and other great masters.

Armand Hammer said that he chose Odessa to mount the exhibition not only because it is where his father was born but also because it is near this city, in Yuzhniy, that the Odessa port plant, a very large ammoniate fertilizer production enterprise in whose construction Occidental Petroleum took part on a barter basis, operates.

"This plant," Hammer noted, "is a fine example of how the USSR and the United States can successfully cooperate to mutual advantage. The Soviet partners have always clearly kept to their contract commitments. I am convinced of this by more than 60 years experience of cooperation with them.

"The Soviet Union's extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 is a concrete and bold step on the path toward preventing nuclear war. The new political thinking corresponding to the realities of the nuclear age, a thinking consistently demonstrated by the Soviet Union," Armand Hammer stressed, "makes me, a man made wiser by a lifetime's experience, an optimist."

"WITHOUT THE NEW THINKING WHICH THE SOVIET UNION CONSISTENTLY DEMONSTRATES TO THE WORLD TODAY, THE VERY EXISTENCE OF HUMAN CIVILIZATION BECOMES IMPOSSIBLE" — Professor Robert Gale of California University, the well-known U.S. bone marrow transplant specialist, stated to your TASS correspondent. "Despite the differences in their political and socioeconomic systems, people are obliged to learn the art of peaceful coexistence if they want to go on living at all."

"I am convinced that nuclear weapons must be completely destroyed, as the Soviet Union proposes. The way to achieving this humanitarian goal runs through trust. The latter may be creted when people come to know one another better."

U.S. Propaganda 'Attack'

AU080610 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 3 Sep 86 p 2

[NOVOSTI article "Specially for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI" by NOVOSTI commentator Spartak Beglov: "'Knights Move' in Washington"]

[Text] Of all the official "arguments" put forth by Washington against the new Soviet call for a halt to nuclear tests, I was the most surprised by the one saying that Moscow is allegedly presenting the abovementioned initiative with complete detachment from the subject of nuclear disarmament. White House spokesman Larry Speakes was the first to present such an argument to the world last Friday, complaining at the same time that Mikhail Gorbachev had avoided the problem of arms reductions in his 18 August statement. L. Speakes said that if the USSR is interested in eliminating nuclear arms, it should occupy itself with this matter.

As we can see, American Government circles have reached the conclusion that maintaining a defensive position is inconvenient and that the time has come to proceed to an attack. In the currently popular language of chess, this is called playing the knight. As we know, a knight may jump over several pieces to reach a selected position. And the calculations are not difficult to guess — not everyone in the West has acquainted himself with the full text of the Soviet diplomat's statement expressing in a precise and business-like way the USSR's stance on arms reductions and nuclear disarmament.

It is difficult to regard this propaganda move or gambit by Washington as a legitimate one. One must have a special knack for distorting facts to see any avoidance of matters of disarmament in the Soviet proposals concerning the elimination of nuclear weapons and radical arms reductions. However, if this issue is meant to be understood as nothing other than a struggle by Washington to achieve disarmament by constantly increasing arms, then Moscow is no partner in this. It is not a policy of control over armaments that the U.S. Government is implementing, but obscurantism, revealing the basic difference in our times between the force of inertia, dictated by the difference in our times between the force of inertia, dictated by the old way of thinking and acting, on the one hand, and the new way of thinking, demanding world-wide unity in the face of the common danger of nuclear catastrophe, on the other.

It is worth taking at least one more look at the stormy past months of the year which the United Nations proclaimed to be the International Peace Year. On 15 January, the Soviet leader issued a bold plan of gradually eliminating nuclear arsenals and other types of mass-destruction weapons. Exactly six months have elapsed since the day when the 27th CPSU Congress presented a program for a universal system of international security while stressing at the same time that no one can guarantee such security with the aid of military and technological resources. Security can only be achieved by political means. In Geneva, the USSR presented a package of constructive proposals concerning a reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. As far as a ban on chemical weapons is concerned, socialist Eastern Europe displayed everywhere a readiness to seek compromise solutions to problems causing disputes and suspicion during the Stockholm talks and in Vienna.

All this was done during the Soviet moratorium on all kinds of nuclear detonations, which has already been in force for one year and has been extended three times. Mikhail Gorbachev thought it appropriate to recall this entire complex of initiatives that is

awaiting a reply when he announced 10 days ago that the Soviet moratorium, which in itself requires proper political consideration also by the American side, would be extended.

But if the Soviet moratorium provides evidence of the seriousness and honesty of the entire Soviet nuclear disarmament program, then Washington's avoidance of reciprocity diminishes the credibility of American politics concerning modern-day problems even more. One cannot avoid the conclusion that throughout 1986, Washington has been seeking and finding satisfaction in demonstrating force and concentrating energy in those places where new and better weapons are being developed. It looks as if Washington has begun to think that all of the United States achievements are the result of a rise in its military might and that all losses are the result of negotiations and accords. This odd policy makes national security seem incompatible with international security. Here is a concrete example. A treaty on the nuclear nonproliferation was enacted 16 years ago. Did it not strengthen the security of the Americans as cosignatories? I believe that not even in the United States will we find anyone who denies this. [paragraph continues]

But this same treaty committed the United States and the other nuclear powers who signed it to reaching an accord on a ban on all types of nuclear tests as quickly as possible. And what are the so-called guardians of U.S. national security aiming toward? They are more than ever opposed to a halt to nuclear tests and, therefore, opposed to the first step leading to a world free of nuclear weapons, in other words, a really safe world. From Nevada one can smell "restricted nuclear" and "star" wars at a time when White House representatives are still trying to assure everyone that no one is defending the "spirit of Geneva" more firmly than they.

Urgency Stressed

PM111701 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 7 Sep 86 p 5

["Notes From a Press Conference" prepared by Yuriy Bandura and Yuriy Buksin: "Before We Have Only Seconds"]

[Text] Seven minutes to midnight. That was the time shown in 1980 by the symbolical clock on the cover of a U.S. magazine. "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists", to remind people how near we have come to the brink of the thermonuclear abyss: seven minutes to catastrophe. A year later the hands on the dial were moved three minutes closer to the tragic end of civilization, after the experts had assessed the nature of the Reagan adminitration's new military programmes.

Question by MN: What is the time shown by this clock today, after the extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts till January 1, 1987?

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, Director, Institute of the USA and Canada, USSR Academy of Sciences:

Today, two hands are gripping the handle used to set the clock's hands. One of them is striving to set the hands back and, maybe, even to push the hands nearer to the fateful line. We are at present at the decisive frontier and the future will show which hand is the stronger. But the matter is not only in the future. I think that the direction in which the hands will move depends on everybody — the Europeans, the Asians, the Americans and the Soviet people. On everyone. This is our common concern.

Valentin Falin, Board Chairman, NOVOSTI Press Agency:

The clock, which for a long time used to be a symbol, has turned now into a sort of reality. Considering the deployment in Western Europe of U.S. first-strike weapons when their flight time to target is 6-8 minutes, the 54 minutes left behind already correspond to reality — we are living six minutes to war. And if we assume that the Americans start to implement the SDI programme, then humanity will find itself removed from war by only 30 seconds. In that case, any short-circuit in the system called Strategic Defense Initiative will entail irreversible consequences. Therefore, the question of how to reverse the clock hands is a task for the entire humanity and a very pressing task. Because the clock is working — it is registering your time and our time.

Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy, member, Committee of Soviet Scientists for Peace, Against Nuclear Threat; editor-in chief, "Chemistry of High Energies" Magazine:

I'd like only to add using the now so popular chess terminology, that the world is faced with the grave danger of the flag falling on the clock. And this first move needed in this time of trouble is the immediate ending of nuclear tests. [answer ends]

Yes, time imperiously demands action in the name of peace. The prolongation by the USSR of a moratorium is a befitting reply to this demand — such was the consensus of opinion of the three experts who spoke to the journalists at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"The further on, the more clear it becomes that the ending of nuclear blasts is not simply a second-rate measure. It is not just a political gesture and not simply a symbol of goodwill, but a major practical step of paramount importance, and I stress — a practical step along the road towards the ending of the nuclear arms race and removal of the nuclear threat," Georgiy Arbatov said at the press conference.

Thepeople at the Press Centre were offered to imagine a mirror situation — The USA doesnot detonate nuclear blasts for a year and then declares that it is extending this nuclear Lent, so to speak, for six more months, whereas the USSR is continuing, meanwhile, exploding one bomb after another, and its media simply keeps silent about this. It is easy to imagine the Biblical wrath the U.S. press, TV and radio would be raining down on us every day — and would probably be right in so doing. But not we are encountering an absolutely different situation."

This situation is simple: The latest Soviet proposals encounter in the USA a sort of conspiracy of silence. And it is not a spontaneous, but a well-organized conspiracy.

An example was cited at the press conference: The U.S. NBC TV network conceived an interesting series of programmes-dialogues, with the participation of prominent people from the USSR and the USA _- defence and foreign ministers, military leaders from the general staffs and, maybe, political leaders. The U.S. Government, however, was against the idea.

The pressure is mounting. A few days ago, Donald Reagan, White House Chief of Staff, openly hinted, in a very annoyed manner, that the attention given to the Soviet moratorium would be regarded as the mode of action which the USSR was aiming to achieve.

The irritation is quite understandable. The NEW YORK TIMES wrote, a day before the peremptory shout voiced in Santa Barabara by the White House spokesman: The Reagan

Administration.... is having trouble shaping the public debates over the issue of nuclear testing is synonymous in the public mind with the arms race and that the idea of stopping testing is one of that appeals to the popular imagination."

But what appeals to the popular imagination foes not appear at all to the imagination of those who govern this people. The White House, ever since Hiroshima Day 1985 when the Soviet state imposed a moratorium on its own nuclear tests, has been rejecting the very idea of ending tests of nuclear weapons.

Answering the question by the correspondent of the GDR TV, Valentin Falin said that the Soviet moratorium offers a realistic opportunity for a transfer to the fulfillment of the accords, reached in Geneva last year:

"The question of ending nuclear weapon tests is today the most simply question both technially and politically. It is simple because the USSR has not been testing for a year already. It is simple because the goodwil! on the part of the USA is indicated above all to settle the question. In the current year the USSR has made various proposals in order to reach the relevant accords. Unfortunately, the U.S. side did not accept a single one and, if we were to judge by the facts, they were not even considered seriously. In the meanwhile, the answer to what both powers want for the future, is contained precisely in nuclear weapon tests or in rejecting them — do they want to further expand preparations for a nuclear war or have they really decided to reverse the events in this field and bring about the deatomization of the world?"

Why, then, does the USA not agree to the moratorium? Why does it continue to deafen the Earth with new blasts? This question it continue to defen the Earth with new blasts? This question was subjected to all-around discussion at the press conference. Answering it, Vitaliy Goldanskiy explained:

"The necessary components of all nuclear weapons are the explosives of the A-bombs and the 'fuse' of a thermonuclear mixture in the H-bombs. The explosives are plutonium, uranium-235 or uranium-238, and the 'fuse' is lithium deuteride or a deuterium-lithium mixture. [paragraph continues]

All of them are absolutely stable in the nuclear sense, and only the third one — a component of the deuterium-tritium mixture — lasts only a few years (its half-life is equal to 12.5 years). That's why tritium is periodically replaced in thermonuclear weapons. This is done without any nuclear blasts.

"Nuclear weapons go off when uranium-235 or plutonium are transferred to a supercritical state. This is achieved either by 'shooting' one block of a relevant substance into another, or by subjecting this substance to pressure from all sides with the aid of conventional explosives. Therefore, the design of each nuclear bomb, warhead, or shell includes a charge of conventional explosive, as well as detonators for this explosive which include mechanical, electric and radioengineering devices. And, lastly, nuclear weapons include all sorts of assembly-structural parts made of different materials.

"When the weapons are in storage, all sorts of 'destructive' processes may be taking place in them. For example, the charges of conventional explosives may crack or suffer from chemical decay and uranium and plutonium are rather sensitive to corrosion.

"The matter is, however, that if we speak of already tested, series-produced nuclear weapons already accepted by the army, then there is no need for test explosions to

check up on the weapons' reliability. It is enough to check up on its separate components. The weapon can even be tested as a whole, but without the nuclear components. All sorts of methods of flaw detection and introscopy which make it possible to 'look inside the material' and methods of non-destructive control which are already very well developed, exist for this purpose."

Academician Goldanskiy's conclusion:

"Nuclear tests are really needed only for the development of new weapons systems, when, for example, it is necessary to secure a greater yield with the same size weapon, to reduce the weight or the size of the weapon, or to adapt the shape of nuclear warheads to new types of carriers. Explosions are also used to check up on the multiple-warhead capability, to test the behaviour of the warhead in extreme conditions, for example, within strong radiation fields. They are also used to study the possibility of pumping of an X-ray laser by a nuclear blast for the SDI programme (this is already the nuclear weapons of third generation). There are also reports of plans to use — along with uranium-235 and plutonium — also transplutonium elements such as, for example, californium. This makes it clear that when there is talk about 'testing of reliability' what is really meant is testing (by explosions) new means for waging thermonuclear war."

This is a well-grounded conclusion. However, modernization is not the USA's only goal. Valentin Falin drew attention to Washington's other goal:

"The Americans persist on a policy that attempts to draw the USSR into the race of developing new weapons systems. And such systems are getting costlier with each passing day. In other words, the idea is to employ the dangerous method of waging war without the practical employment of weapons. The USA has officially been adhering to this course since 1947 when the objective was formulated: to put the USSR in such unfavourable external conditions under which its system would be functioning under maximum stresses imposed from outside."

According to Georgiy Arbatov, similar goals can be discerned also in the U.S. Star Wars programme. The Academician substantiated his conclusion with the following example:

"A group of Soviet scientists recently visited the USA. And the U.S. space weapons experts from the Livermore Laboratory went out of their way to try to persuade us: 'Let's build up strategic defence together!' They even invited us to visit their laboratory. But why did they ask at all? Because they are counting on undermining us economically. But we state well in advance that all such plans made by Washington will fail. And, by the way, the Americans are already undermining their own positions by exorbitant military spending."

However, Washington's plans are dangerous not at all because they are doomed to failure. The danger is that the piling up of ever new heaps of arms is creating a situation that can escape the control at any moment.

Valentin Falin said: "If things develop the way Washington's leaders wish them to develop — and there is talk in Washington about the need of adding to the U.S. arsenals of not only binary, but bacteriological weapons as well, then the question of 'whether the catastrophe will happen' will be replaced with the question 'when will it happen?'"

Do the people in the White House realize the inevitability of such an outcome? Georgiy Arbatov answered this question:

"I think, the USA will change its stand when it becomes clear to the U.S. leaders that it is impossible to act otherwise, when the situation that is taking shape both in the USA and in the world will force them to do so.

"I remember discussing recently the breakdown in Chernobyl with an American friend of mine. He admitted that this tragedy dictates absolutely new approaches. He said that the most terrible act the USSR could commit against the USA could be to explode all its nuclear warheads on its own territory. Then, he said, you in the USSR would die in an instant and nearly painless death whereas we, Americans, would have to die for a long time tormented by nightmares. And that is really a facet of the present-day situation.

The situation, apparently, is really approaching the critical point, if it is already putting certain people into a suicidal dead end, where the only choice left is between instant death and death dragged out for decades. A sinister alternative. But it is also begotten by reality — by the cruel realities of the thermonuclear age.

Capitalizing on the "mirror method" already mentioned at the press conference, it would be the easiest thing in the world to readdress the American's recommendation to Washington. But the USSR is proposing something different. It proposes not a method for a kill all, but a way for survival. And by introducing the moratorium the USSR has already taken to this road.

That is why one would like to believe that Washington would really start seeking qualitatively new approaches to our time. One would like this metamorphosis, if it is fated to happen at all, to happen as soon as possible. However, one cannot as yet see, alas!, any tangible signs of a turn towards common sense in the top echelons of the U.S. Administration. What is much more noticeable is something quite different:

the reluctance to make even the first step along the road to ending nuclear tests;

an obsession with the Strategic Defense Initiative;

the outdated adherence to aggravating tensions in different global areas (as it is done today in the Mediterranean, offshore Libya);

the preparedness to discard the SALT-2 treaty.

Neither did journalists fail to notice the words recently spoken by Larry Speakes, White House Deputy Press Secretary. He said that if the Russians wanted a summit, that was good, if they didn't that suited the Americans fine, too. Everyone who cherishes a peaceful future wants a new Soviet-U.S. summit — granted there is a relevant political climate and the U.S. administration is prepared to start, at long last, the stone rolling. Everybody, that is, except the USA whose stand was explained by Speakes: as it turns out Washington is highly indifferent to whether the summit will or will not be held.

But, then, is it really indiffierent? According to Valentin Falin, the disdainful indifference of the White House spokesman was nothing else but evidence of the sheer arrogance which has become deeply rooted in Washington. It is tantamount to the confession: "We don't care whether or not there will be a nuclear war."

However, the blasts in Nevada show that the White House's indifference is a mask. Because war preparations are going on full swing.

Georgiy Arbatov sees under the mask of the current administratio the desire to destroy -- even before 1988, the year of the next presidential elections, -- as many of the obstacles as possible that are blocking the road to the arms race, so that Ronald Reagan's successors will not be able to rehabilitate anything, no matter how much they would like to do so. A participant in the press conference called such a strategy -- the "bulldozer syndrome".

The bulldozer of catastrophe continues to squash the world's security. We are reminded of this by the symbolical clock which is leaving us less and less time to avert tragedy.

U.S. 'Cave Mentality'

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 8 Sep 86 pp 1-4

[Article by APN Political Analyst Vladimir Katin: "Commonsense vs. Nuclear Madness"]

[Text] The Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests has actually made it possible to hold a kind of international referendum on this issue. People in all parts of the world have welcomed Moscow's decision to stop nuclear tests until the beginning of next year.

Politicians and MPs, public figures and mass organizations regarded that action as an example of sensible and correct approach to universal security and a hope for abating nuclear fears. The Soviet moratorium was approved by the UN General Assembly, the Delhi Six member-states with the population of one billion, the heads of state and government of non-aligned countries representing nearly two thirds of the world's states. The leaders of the non-aligned countries attending their 8th conference in Harare appealed to all nuclear powers, first of all to the United States, to join the Soviet moratorium.

I think it is very typical of the present situation that actually no one except the Washington administration regards the moratorium as an action "beneficial" only to the Soviet Union. It is clear to everyone that the ban will benefit the whole world by saving it from destruction. I don't think that it was out of sympathy for the Soviet Union or dislike for the United States that government agencies and officials in West Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, Japan and other Western countries welcomed the extension of the Soviet moratorium, and Norway, Denmark and Greece expressed their disagreement with the U.S. administration's stand on a nuclear tests ban. Incidentally, such a disagreement was voiced by municipal councils of over 100 cities in the United States itself.

It is an obvious sign that the new mentality for our nuclear age is catching on among top-ranking officials and the public at large. Indeed, an increasing number of people come to realise that human civilization will

not survive a nuclear holocaust. The most perfect technological systems might prove to be faulty, witness the recent Challenger and Chernobyl accidents.

Therefore, urgent measures are needed to reduce the risk of nuclear war. The verifiable and complete ban on nuclear tests might become the first step along this road. Actually, the cessation of such tests can be compared with an ignition key in the mechanism of the arms race. Suffice it to turn the key to a neutral position, that is, cease the tests, and the nuclear arms race will lose momentum, slow down and soon come to a halt.

The unilateral Soviet moratorium has been supported throughout the world because this proposal is, in fact, a practical step towards the creation of a non-nuclear world. By refraining from the nuclear tests the Soviet Union is acting in compliance with the agreements achieved at the last November's USSR-USA summit in Geneva. I would like to emphasize this fact because the Geneva conference gave all nations a hope for an improvement, a fair spell in our planet's political climate. Thus on its part Moscow has taken another concrete political action to implement the Geneva agreements.

Regrettably, the United States has not made a positive response to it. Moreover, each time the Soviet Union extended its moratorium, the U.S. carried its further tests at the Nevada testing-grounds, with the latest on September 4. Were they a challenge to Moscow? Well, I've rather say, they were a challenge to the entire world and humanity.

The U.S. administration's nuclear obsession can ruin our Planet Earth. Not long ago U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger speaking at an American Legion convention again called for building up his country's nuclear potential and implementing SDI ahead of time. What it means, is an increasing number of nuclear tests to be csrried out in the immediate future in order to speed up the development of the first-strike weapons. As for U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, he openly declares that he is against a universal agreement on a nuclear tests ban, even if it could be verified. Those are obvious examples of not only selfish but, rather backward mentality and inability to realize the full-measure of one's responsibility.

Such is the United State's attitude towards the discontinatuion of nuclear tests, which also reveals its stand on the nuclear weapons issue. By opposing itself to the rest of the world, the U.S. administration is leading the arms race and thus giving it an even more dangerous, space momentum. We are fully aware of the goals which the right-wing, militarist grouping in the USA is setting itself: to do its best to maintain its war-business profits, attain military superiority and wear out the USSR economically. Eventually, all that can be reduced to an idea of seeking global dominance.

Such a policy line, plans and ideas are another specimen of cave mentality which is alien to our nuclear age. If a nuclear war broke out (which is, obviously, the aim of politicians like Weinberger), no one would survive to estimate the profit yielded by the production and sale of warheads. It would be asburd to think of gaining military supremacy over the Soviet Union or bringing its economy to ruin by the arms race. The Soviet leaders will never let it happen which is guaranteed by the Soviet Union's enormous economic, technological and scientific potential.

We will have to wait and see. However, the Soviet people would like to hope that the United States' further actions will be guided by realism and understanding of the need for joint efforts aimed at improving the international situation, curbing the senseless arms race and eliminating nuclear weapons. We would like to hope that common sense will triumph at last over the nuclear madness.

Scientist Outlines Benefits

PM110901 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 5-6

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Aleksandr Kalyadin, member of the World Federation of Scientific Workers Standing Committee on Disarmament, under the general heading "The Historic Chance Must Not Be Missed": "A Scholar's View. To Think and Act in a New Way"]

[Text] Today the issue of the complete and universal cessation of nuclear weapon tests is exceptionally acute. On the one hand, these tests feed the nuclear arms race, which is about to escalate to a still more dangerous level, on the other, new political, scientific and technological options have emerged that make a test ban completely verifiable. And here one must first note the unilateral moratorium which the USSR recently extended for the fourth time plus the other constructive Soviet initiatives and programmes, demonstrating the effectiveness of the new mode of political thinking. The world community as a whole and prominent politicians and statesmen in many countries are more and more resolutely exhorting other nuclear powers, especially the U.S., to emulate the Soviet example, stop tests, and sign an agreement definitively outlawing them.

The advocacy of scientists for a ban on nuclear explosions is also significant. Recently scientists from various disciplines, who are analyzing problems associated with a test ban, have come together in several countries. Such prestigious international associations as the Pugwash Movement, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, and the recently created International Initiative Group are helping them to pool efforts.

Global Hazards

Two representative conferences, the International Forum of Scientists on Nuclear Test Ban and the International "Science, Technology and Peace" forum,

both held in Moscow not long ago, have discussed the major results obtained from a comprehensive investigation of problems related to a nuclear test ban. The Soviet moratorium, as Mikhail Gorbachev noted, has encouraged the participants, though they are of different political persuasions and have different approaches to the specific ways and means of ending nuclear testing, to vigorous action. After all, scientists are more fully aware than other people of the dangers of the atom. The conclusions and assessments at which they have arrived through an unbiassed comprehensive analysis of all relevant aspects are of heightened interest.

One crucial conclusion is that the tests lead to the escalation of the arms race to a dangerously new and higher level, by which is meant the development of weapon systems and types with an increasingly diverse overkill, including some that can be used in space. The armed forces buildup will inevitably entail the development of a first-strike potential. There will be more nuclear munitions with a multiplied overkill. We can expect third-generation nuclear weaponry with selectively amplified factors. All this will upset the strategic equilibrium, thus entailing unpredictable consequences.

Regional stability and safety will suffer, inasmuch as continuing to test will exacerbate nuclear proliferation and give those who want nuclear weapons in the so-called "near-nuclear states" a freer hand.

Nuclear testing is likewise fraught with global hazards of another type. Ecologists are of the view that the earth we live on has reached a point where nuclear explosions must be outlawed immediately.

Japanese medical research has revealed that the radioactive contamination of the Pacific's surface by nuclear tests is correlated with the increasing incidence of a whole range of illnesses. Moreover, scientists have observed the genetic effects of nuclear detonations. Hence it is vital to stop the tests at once for the sake not only of the present but of successive generations. Otherwise humanity will face unforseeable consequences deriving from modifications in the biosphere's genetic stock.

What a Test Ban Would Bring

First, it would result in greater strategic stability. After all, it is extremely difficult to boost buildup of the nuclear weapons and their modernization without tests. There would be far fewer opportunities for developing new strategic, operational, tactical, and medium-range nuclear weapon types and systems, as well as warheads for some carrier vehicles, such as cruise missiles, which constitute a destabilizing factor in that they are difficult to verify.

An end to testing would also be of paramount significance in restraining the augmentation of stocks of offensive nuclear armaments. Experts maintain that this would drastically minimize the likelihood of nuclear conflict, which would also serve to consolidate reciprocal security.

An end to testing would stonewall programmes for developing space-based strike weaponry, of which the X-ray laser, powered by nuclear detonation, is a possible crucial component.

Finally, comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban subject to appropriate international control procedures would serve to consolidate international confidence and ameliorate the world political situation. In fact, the related control machinery could prove of great benefit for promoting other aspects of disarmament.

Verification Is No Problem

For years the thesis that a moratorium is not effectively verifiable has been trotted out as the basic argument against an agreement for the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon testing. Seismologists, physicists and mathematicians equally declare that the technical aspects of control are no obstacle to the immediate cessation of nuclear explosions and the conclusion of the appropriate international treaty. On the contrary, the latest scientific data demonstrate that achievements in seismology and other disciplines and the higher level of international scientific cooperation in the area of verification afford far greater possibilities today for detecting and identifying explosions.

Major progress has been reached in the field of national seismic control measures. Thus, whereas in the 1970's only one-kiloton explosions could be recorded by the means then available for identifying seismic phenomena, today explosions of under 0.1 kilotons can already be detected. In fact, a seismological station can identify 20-30-ton underground explosions even from a distance of 2,000-3,000 kilometres. With several stations working to this end the potential for detection will be correspondingly greater.

Soviet seismologists say they can hear a one-kiloton explosion from 10,000 kilometres away. This is illustrated by the registration within the Soviet Union of a Nevada nuclear detonation. By means of the national seismological control stations within its boundaries the Soviet Union has been able, over a lengthy period of observation, to pinpoint and identify nuclear explosions of about one kiloton. On the other hand, U.S. seismologists claim that by employing similar control measures, the U.S. has not missed a single Soviet explosion of one kiloton or more over the past 20 years. It was held until lately that nuclear explosions could nevertheless be concealed through decoupling, which means the jamming of seismic signals by explosions within spherical subterranean cavities. However, calculations have convincingly demonstrated that the seismological control stations we have today are in a position to register nuclear detonations of this nature, even of low capacity to all practical intents, it is impossible to conceal the creation of the necessary subterranean cavities, given other control measures such as observation from artificial earth satellites. After all, to decouple completely an 8-kiloton explosion it would be necessary to extract as much rock as it took to build the Pyramid of Cheops.

International scientific cooperation is a highly effective method of broadening possibilities and improving seismological control techniques. With this end in view and in line with the corresponding agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defence Council, a joint Soviet-American experiment is being conducted and some initial results have already been obtained.

Likewise of great significance is the multilateral cooperation within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference of seismologists mounting technological experiments of an international character. The latest such experiment in 1984 involved 72 stations in 32 countries, including the USSR. These experiments have shown that the procedures which have been evolved are most effective. Currently in the preparatory stage is one more experiment in which the USSR is also involved, which will be carried out to lay the groundwork for an international system of seismological control over a nuclear test ban. This is one more major vehicle for cooperation and confidence, making for the successful application of science's latest achievements in the interests of peace.

Seismological control is by no means the only means of verification. Other methods that could be employed include hydroacoustic techniques on the high seas and satellites for the observation of the Earth's surface.

Consequently it may be stated that the present record of achievement in science in conjunction with cooperation between scientists in different countries have given substantial support to the conviction that control is not a stumbling block in prohibiting nuclear explosions in every medium.

The fundamental problem is political, not technological. This only amplifies the role and responsibility borne by all social forces, including scientists and their organizations. It behoves them to bring to the attention of governments and the public at large the available scientific data, their assessments of the pernicious consequences of continued nuclear testing, and the possibilities that now exist for ending these tests.

Finnish Politician Cited

LD092349 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Helsinki, 9 September (TASS)--The Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions has been highly appraised by general secretary of the Social Democratic Party of Finland, chairman of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission Erkki Liikanen.

Speaking in Mikkeli at a function of twinned cities of the USSR and Finland, he called upon other nuclear powers to join the moratorium. A ban on tests of nuclear weapons would be the first step towards elimination of all nuclear armaments. That would be a turn to real disarmament, said Erkki Liikanen.

A ban on tests of nuclear weapons would be the most efficient and fast measure to end the nuclear arms race, he believes. A ban on nuclear tests would stop development of new types of nuclear weapons.

Speaking of the Soviet-Finnish relations, Erkki Liikanen has said that these relations are based on mutual respect in accordance with the principle of peaceful coexistence in the relations between the two states.

'Disarmament Tango' Urged

LD101738 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 10 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 10 TASS — News analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Silence reigns at Soviet nuclear testing sites for already the second year. The USSR has unilaterally stopped nuclear tests and is observing its voluntary moratorium. American instruments have been installed near the Soviet nuclear testing site in Semipalatinsk Region on agreement between Soviet and American scientists as a measure of verifying nuclear explosions.

On the other hand, the United States has carried out already 19 nuclear tests during the Soviet moratorium and, as the American press reports, is preparing new ones. No reasonable justification of this policy pursued by Washington exists. There is a spate of invented arguments in favour of continued nuclear testing by the United States. For instance, there is the attempt to contrapose the moratorium and arms reduction and even to prove that the moratorium and arms reduction and even to prove that the moratorium supposedly is a hindrance to starting the process of disarmament.

This is absurd but Washington uses this absurdity as a screen to conceal its reluctance to get down to the business of disarmament. But it is long time to start the process of limiting and stopping arms race because time is running out. Today the question stands as follows either an agreement is reached on stopping nuclear tests once and for all or the green light is given to even more dangerous military preparations involving the spreading of the arms race to outer space. No matter how they in Washington try to prove the opposite, the ending of nuclear tests is inseparably linked with a reduction of nuclear arsenals. Specialists in many countries, including American specialists, believe that a ban on nuclear explosions is probably the quickest and most effective way of stopping a further development of nuclear arms, because nuclear tests serve the only purpose of perfecting existing nuclear arms and creating new types of arms, including space weapons, to wage nuclear war.

If the United States Government does not want to stop nuclear testing and stubbornly continues the arms race, this means that it has on its mind preparations to unleash a new world war. The logic and consistency of action of the administration in Washington present an alarming picture. The present administration not only shows no interest in ending nuclear tests but also rejects out of hand proposals to this end. It can be said, figuratively, that whereas it takes "only two to tango" (meaning the process of disarmament at the present stage), the arms race in the near future is likely to become a real rock'n roll with an unlimited number of "dancers". Now is the best time for Washington and Moscow to start a "disarmament tango" precisely with a termination of nuclear blasts. All objective conditions have ripened for this. It is only political will on the part of the White House that is lacking.

'Lack of Political Will'

PM121211 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 11 Sep 86 p 3

[G. Dadyants "Dialogue with a Reader": "What Are They Testing in Nevada?"--first graf is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] We continue our dialogue with readers on key problems of international politics. SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants replies to questions from S. Khudyakov, team leader at the Karbolit science-and-production association (Kemerovo city) superhard molding powders shop.

[Khudyakov] I have read in the newspapers that the Americans have carried out another nuclear test in Nevada. Are there any details about this?

[Dadyants] Judging by U.S. press reports, the explosion was carried out on the morning of 4 September in a deep underground shaft and its yield was equivalent to a force 3.5 underground tremor. The explosion was carried out as part of secret military research conducted by the Los Alamos atomic laboratory. The test was code-named Galveston. Incidentally, this laboratory is currently working on devices connected with the testing [otrabotka] of so-called beam weapons. This was already the 19th test since the USSR announcement of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions on 6 August 1985, which has been extended four times.

[Khudyakov] People in our shop are saying that M.S. Gorbachev has driven the R. Reagan administration into a corner by his convincing arguments in favor of the moratorium. It would be interesting to know how U.S. propaganda is trying to get around this? What are its arguments in defense of the nuclear explosions?

[Dadyants] To be frank, this is being done rather clumsily. As you know, to begin with it was claimed that the United States was allegedly "lagging" behind the USSR in nuclear tests and that it had to catch up. However, this claim is totally at variance with the facts. In 1985, for instance, the United States carried out around 20 nuclear explosions, while the USSR carried out only 9 explosions prior to the introduction of the moratorium, and 2 of those were for peaceful purposes. In all the United States has carried out around 800 tests, which is more than the number of nuclear tests carried out by all other nuclear powers together and one-third more than the number of tests carried out by the Soviet Union.

When the argument about "lagging" failed, they came up with another, namely that the tests were essential for the United States to check the reliability of existing nuclear devices. However, this argument was quickly rejected by military experts: Existing nuclear weapons do not require any checking, they are constantly kept "in working order," in other words "they cannot get rusty."

But since there is no lag and no checking, then what? There remains only one conclusion: The United States needs the tests to create new types of nuclear arms, including so-called "third generation" weapons. However, it does not want to admit this openly because this would result in the United States' appearing in a very unfavorable light before the world public.

[Khudyakov] Do we know what types of weapons the Americans are testing in Nevada?

[Dadyants] Military experts are unanimous on this question. First, flight tests of the new MX missile are currently being carried out in the United States and new, more powerful warheads with even more accurate guidance systems are needed for that missile. Second, several types of warheads for the smaller Midgetman missile are being developed [razrabatyvayutsya]. Third, tests are needed to create new warheads for the sea-launched Trident-2 missiles. Fourth, work is under way on warheads for the next generation of strategic missiles. Fifth, new types of neutron warheads primarily for artillery and the so-called "operational-tactical" missiles are being tested. And, sixth, last but not least in significance, work is underway in Nevada on testing nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers and the transformation of nuclear explosions into other forms of energy to hit various targets in space--in other words on the implementation of the "star wars" program.

In short, the U.S. Administration is by no means carrying out nuclear explosions in Nevada to check old nuclear devices but rather to improve and create new types of nuclear and space weapons.

[Khudyakov] The Americans have detonated 19 nuclear devices, yet they have announced only 15 of them. Consequently, four tests including the latest were secret. How did we manage to detect them?

[Dadyants] At the present time it is impossible to conduct "secret" explosions. Even the lowest-yield explosions are immediately registered by national verification [proverka] means. As you know, a group of U.S. scientists is currently working near Semipalatinsk, recording not only the silence at our nuclear testing grounds but also the American explosions in Nevada.

[Khudyakov] But if we can detect their tests, does this not mean that the U.S. Administration's argument about "verification" [kontrol] crumbles?

[Dadyants] Indeed, it is yet another argument in favor of the feasibility of effective verification [kontrol] of all nuclear explosions. The USSR, let me recall, is prepared to agree to all types of verification [kontrol] up to and including on-site inspections. Meanwhile the United States continues to describe "verification" as an obstacle to the conclusion of an agreement. Quite recently, Regan, the White House chief of staff, said something to the effect that the United States is not against a treaty on a total and comprehensive ban on nuclear tests but that it is against the

conclusion of such a treaty "without a proper verification [kontrol] system." So where is the problem, Mr Reagan? We are prepared to agree to verification, but is the United States prepared to end its explosions under proper verification, including international verification [kontrol]? It appears that it is not. The White House spokesman Speakes declared openly that ending the tests "does not accord with U.S. security interests." So that the problem is not verification [kontrol] but a lack of political will on the part of the U.S. leaders.

[Khudyakov] Is there any hope that the Americans will nonetheless heed the voice of reason and agree to end tests and join the moratorium declared by the Soviet Union? Or are they a hopeless case?

[Dadyants] It was mentioned in the U.S. press that the United States intends to carry out a total of 100 explosions in order to implement the "program" outlined by the Pentagon. The military-industrial complex has a vested interest in the new round of nuclear arms race and will, of course, do everything in its power to prevent an agreement being reached. However, it is obvious that public opinion, including public opinion in the United States itself, cannot be ignored. According to opinion polls 80 percent of Americans favor ending the nuclear tests. The U.S. House of Representatives has voted in favor of ending nuclear tests with yields over 1 kiloton. This resolution provoked a stormy reaction from the administration. The White House declared that the Congress was jeopardizing U.S. "security." In other words, a struggle is being waged around the problem of ending nuclear tests. It is difficult to tell how it will end.

M.S. Gorbachev in his 18 August statement said that it might be possible to sign an agreement on ending nuclear tests in the course of the upcoming Soviet-American summit. We will have to wait and see what baggage the U.S. leaders are preparing for that meeting.

[Khudyakov] Is the long silence at the Soviet nuclear testing grounds not fraught with a threat to our country's security? After all, the Americans have been testing nuclear weapons for more than a year now while we have not.

[Dadyants] The decision to extend the moratorium has not been easy for us, of course, and M.S. Gorbachev openly said so in his statement. There is a certain price to pay. However, the political effect gained from extending the moratorium considerably outweighs this price. Just look at the situation which is developing. The Soviet moratorium has the support of the socialist countries, the communist parties, the nonaligned movement, the leaders of the "Delhi Six," public organizations, trade unions, many Western political parties including the West German Social Democrats and the British Laborites, and prominent scientists and cultural figures throughout the world. It would be much easier to name those who did not support this step of ours than those who approved it.

Now that security can be ensured only by political rather than military and technical means, the Soviet moratorium is a most important factor in the creation of a system of international security. "By our actions and initiatives we seek to strengthen peoples' hope that the situation can be changed, that there is a feasible alternative to confrontation," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his replies to the questions put by Z. Horeni, chief editor of RUDE PRAVO.

The year without explosions at Soviet nuclear testing grounds is a political and military reality rather than propaganda. The trend toward reason and common sense is actually present in international politics thanks to the Soviet moratorium. Meanwhile those who continue the nuclear explosions in Nevada are undermining both reason and common sense.

'Breakthrough Seen Possible'

PM131309 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Academician Ye. Primakov "Topic of the Day": "The Moratorium's Universality. Thoughts on the Political and Military Effectiveness of Halting Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] There are military political decisions which play a fundamental role in giving rise to new trends and opening up fundamentally new paths for the development of the international situation. The Soviet leadership's decision to extend the nuclear test moratorium to 1 January 1987 is certainly one such. The USSR took it upon itself to halt these tests in a situation where the United States is continuing its nuclear explosions at the test site in Nevada. It was no easy decision for the Soviet side. But it was done. It was done with due consideration, not impulsively and not under the influence of any short-term considerations of expediency, as is made clear once again by M.S. Gorbachev's answers to the newspaper RUDE PRAVO's questions.

A New Approach

The Soviet Union's unilateral cessation of nuclear tests is the practical implementation of the foreign policy line outlined at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and given its final form in the 27th Party Congress materials. The CPSU proclaimed that the only way out of the rigid military confrontation, which could result in a lethal explosion for the whole of human civilization, is new approaches to relations between states, and these approaches demand new political thinking. One of the main elements in this thinking is renunciation of attempts to acquire a military advantage over the opposing side as a means of safeguarding one's own security. In other words, a very important conclusion was drawn to the effect that given the present level and real prospects of scientific and technical advances in the military area it would be unwise to rely entirely on military methods of safeguarding security. Political means are needed above all.

Positive ideas acquire real value only when they are given material form. The best way to do this is by example — the ability to put one's own ideas into practice. The USSR has demonstrated this ability. The creation of a substantial opportunity for an accord with the United States on halting nuclear tests, in our view, outweighs the cost the USSR has deliberately borne in extending the moratorium for the fourth time. It should

be noted in particular that it is a question of an accord that takes into account the need for reliable verification [kontrol] of its implementation. No one is suggesting merely that tests should stop, as certain Western opponents of a moratorium would have it. The halting of tests is meant to ensure the commencement of talks and success in achieving a verifiable treaty-based ban on nuclear tests.

Breakthrough

The USSR's decision on an 18-month unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests is a proposal to the United States to accomplish a BREAKTHROUGH [capitalized passages published in boldface] in political thinking in the chief military area. The halting of nuclear tests is geared to curtailing a very dangerous present-day process — the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. Moreover, it is a UNIVERSAL measure in the disarmament sphere which can simultaneously limit the development of all nuclear systems — strategic, medium-range, and operation-tactical. [paragraph continues]

In addition to that a test ban is the quickest and most radical of all the currently feasible arms limitation steps: it avoids a large number of problems connected with technical, strategic, geostrategic, and political imbalances.

It must also be said that the cessation of nuclear tests can play an important part in nuclear nonproliferation, and this problem is becoming an increasingly urgent one. As is known, a substantial number of countries is seeking to create nuclear weapons. The danger is aggravated by the fact that these countries (for example, Israel, South Africa, Pakistan, and South Korea) are threatening their neighbors and are actively involved in regional conflicts. Their reaching the "nuclear mark" may not only pose a serious and direct threat to a number of neighboring states, but also make the world situation even more unstable and, perhaps, spark off a nuclear conflagration.

The Political Aspect

Furthermore, the cessation of nuclear tests can lead to a change in the world social and political climate more effectively than any other immediate, one-shot measure. It can confidently be predicted that in the event of a Soviet-American accord the atmosphere will be right for considerably greater trust between the two countries and this will have very great, even decisive importance in the creation of a favorable climate for resolving dangerous regional conflicts — in the Near East, west and south Asia, Central America, and Africa.

The USSR's decision to extend the nuclear test moratorium, a product of the new political thinking, takes into maximum consideration the sentiments and opinions of politicians, scientists, specialists, and broad strata of the population in various countries. But when switching to the new political thinking it is necessary to take into account the growing role of public opinion in all parts of the world.

During M.S. Gorbachev's 14 July 1986 meeting with the participants of the Moscow international scientists' conference major scientific figures from the United States, Britain, Italy, France, Japan, and Sweden appealed to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to extend the moratorium. A similar appeal was made to the Soviet and U.S. leaders by the "Delhi Six" (Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tansania, and Sweden). Public opinion polls in the United States also show a trend toward an increasing percentage of opponents of nuclear tests. The fact that the Soviet moratorium, despite having been ignored initially by the U.S. press, subsequently, as it was repeatedly extended, acquired a widespread reputation and popularity is no insignificant factor in this.

The Role of the Public

Even when they are protecting their own specific interests, the leaders of the capitalist world cannot turn a blind eye to the importance of public opinion in the elaboration of political decisions. So they try to manipulate it. The consideration of public opinion as a very important factor capable of influencing policy and the desire to prevent malicious manipulation of the public are an essential ingredient of our approach to international affairs. And this has proved its worth.

It is possible to construct a chain of cause and effect: The Soviet Union extends its moratorium four times — this considerably undermines the myths of the "Soviet military threat" and of the "propaganda nature of Soviet foreign policy initiatives — a shift in public opinion in the United States, other NATO countries, and Japan — a certain difference of opinion between the United States and a number of its allies concerning the possibility of compromises vis-a-vis the USSR — a slight shift in the positions of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives on questions connected with talks with the USSR, including those on halting nuclear tests.

The chain lacks the final link — a change in the U.S. Administration's stance. But it can be concluded that irrespective of whether it goes along with the USSR's proposal on banning all nuclear explosions, prefers to hold talks on lowering the threshold, simulates movement, or generally marks time it will be under mounting pressure. But the U.S. Administration already has less room for maneuver than before. To all appearances, this is bound to affect the atmosphere of the next presidential elections in the United States to some extent.

Their "Arguments"

In his replies to the RUDE PRAVO chief editor the CPSU Central Committee general secretary gave a vivid account of the whole range of aspirations which gave rise to the fierce opposition to a nuclear test ban and conducted a most convincing expose of the pseudoarguments used by the champions of nuclear rivalry. Washington has already tried out a whole series of "arguments" against the Soviet proposal to join the moratorium. First it was fictitious problems of verification [kontrol] and then, when the USSR had clearly demonstrated that they in fact do not exist, it was forced to switch to arguments about links between the continuation of nuclear tests and security for the United States and its allies. And the U.S. military are putting forward the thesis that tests are important not only for the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and the switch to other systems, in particular implementation of the "star wars" (SDI) program, but also as a means of checking the combat capability of existing nuclear armaments. But whereas tests actually are needed in order to qualitatively improve nuclear weapons, they are not essential to check existing nuclear warheads, according to the authoritative opinion of leading U.S., other Western, and Soviet scientists. Consequently, when they insist on the continuation of nuclear tests, U.S. politicians and military men are in fact talking not about security, which is based on maintaining strategic military parity with the USSR, but about efforts to overcome it and achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union.

It must be said too that the very refusal by the United States to halt nuclear weapon tests refutes more convincingly than any effort of logic the thesis of official Washington military policy that the United States is seeking to deliver mankind from nuclear weapons — a thesis they use in the attempt to validate the SDI program, which is in fact geared to obtaining a first nuclear strike potential.

We are living in a nuclear-space era, an interrelated, albeit contradictory world. In these conditions the time for making decisions is extremely limited and quickly passes. Realization of this fact not only by the Soviet Union, but by the United States and all other states is meant to pave the way to new political thinking without which mankind would probably be condemning itself to the slippery slope.

Weinberger View 'Absurd'

PM121111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Gan "Rejoinder": "The Secretary and the Cannon"]

[Text] Washington -- Sober-mindedness has never been one of U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's strong points. [paragraph continues]

In fact, the absence of this quality has often been so marked that it has compelled local journalists to compare the Pentagon chief to a "loose cannon on deck," which could burst through the timbers of its own ship in the event of a storm. It is a very apt comparison and, alas, applicable still. It was apparent to readers of THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS on reading an interview with Weinberger the other day. And what he said was absolute rubbish.

For example, what about the Pentagon chief's "subtle hint" that "agents of Moscow," no less, are supposedly ensconced in the U.S. Congress and are implementing a "Soviet agenda"! What is Weinberger actually referring to? "The recommendations in favor of banning nuclear tests, which are essential for determining the effectiveness of the armaments we are forced to rely on," "the sharp reduction in the funds necessary for the development of reliable strategic defenses" (that is, the implementation of the "star wars" program), the ban on testing antisatellite weapons...

Obviously, these steps by the U.S. legislators are murder for the Pentagon. Common sense goes out of the window when the pet creations of the military-industrial complex, which is not accustomed to foregoing its pleasures, are under threat.

But the Pentagon leader thought it wise to keep quiet about the military-industrial complex. Instead, he dredged up the old tale about the Soviet Union's allegedly sitting down at the negotiating table only because "we have built up our military might to a massive degree." In other words, according to Weinberger's logic, the USSR has been guided not by a sincere desire to halt the arms race but by some kind of 'fear' of the United States.

This is patently absurd. Especially as the secretary himself did not bother to conceal the reasons that made him turn logic inside out. "It is very important not to relinquish the many advantages we have obtained as a result of acquiring substantial military might -- we have not yet finished the job," he said.

Weinberger was asked whether there was a possibility of achieving Soviet-American agreements on arms control. "I believe that the Soviet Union wants agreements on arms reductions," he admitted. And the administration? The secretary's reply was accompanied by a proviso: Washington wants agreements which would in no way limit or hamper the "orderly development [razrabotka] of strategic defenses." That is, give the Pentagon a license to militarize space and everything will be fine!

Remember the comparison to a "loose cannon"...

Defense Ministry Expert

PM120921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Colonel V.L. Kotyuzhanskiy, "USSR Defense Ministry Expert," by correspondent B. Ivanov: "Tests of Historical Maturity"]

[Text] Colonel V.L. Kotyuzhanskiy, USSR Defense Ministry expert on questions of banning nuclear weapon tests, recently visited the United States. IZVESTIYA's correspondent met him and asked him to answer some questions.

[Ivanov] Vitaliy Lukich, what was the purpose of your trip?

[Kotyuzhanskiy] Part of my task was to explain the essence of our decision to extend the moratorium: In Washington and New York, at press conferences organized by the USSR Embassy and the Soviet UN Mission, and in meetings with correspondents of leading American newspapers including THE WASHINGTON POST and THE NEW YORK TIMES.

[Ivanov] THE WASHINGTON POST admitted not so long ago that nuclear tests are "the ignition key to the entire arms race: You have only to turn that key and the motor will die." The Republican administration has so far refused to stop the motor of its militarist preparations. Have any changes become apparent, in your view, in the White House's position on the moratorium?

[Kotyuzhanskiy] Unfortunately, we cannot yet speak of any change in the American position. The United States continues to respond to our peace initiatives with explosions in Nevada. Washington's actions are beginning to frighten people more and more. And its attitude to the moratorium on nuclear explosions, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his replies to the RUDE PRAVO chief editor's questions, exposes the real essence and thrust of its policy. This is a test of the U.S. Administration's historical maturity.

The White House is engaged in compiling "arguments" of various kinds to justify Washington's refusal to subscribe to the moratorium.

Let us recall that as long ago as 18 August, that is, on the day our moratorium was extended, White House Deputy Press Secretary L. Speakes declared: "The Soviet Union had carried out a considerable modernization of its nuclear forces before it announced this moratorium. We have not yet finished realizing our response to their modernization by modernizing our forces." Naturally, Speakes did not adduce any proof of this. Why? Because there is none and can be none. The facts indicate the reverse: The United States is the champion in terms of the number of nuclear explosions. It has carried out more of them than all the other nuclear powers put together. It has carried out 50 percent more than the Soviet Union. And throughout the years of testing the United States has led both in terms of the number of explosions in each individual environment (in the atmosphere, under water, and underground) and in terms of their number at any period of time. Over the past 5-10 years, for example, the United States has systematically outstripped the USSR by almost one-third in terms of the number of nuclear tests. During the year of our moratorium a further 18 nuclear devices have been exploded in Nevada (and the teleprinters recently reported a new nuclear explosion in the United States). So, the discrepancy in the number of tests in the U.S. favor has increased still further. These are the statistics. There is no question of any Washington "lag."

[Ivanov] To judge from press reports, appreciable nervousness now reigns in the American capital, and contradictory arguments are being advanced in favor of the United States' continuing nuclear explosions. The White House has announced its intention to keep nuclear weapons in "the foreseeable future." That statement virtually cancels out the U.S. president's solemn declarations at the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva, where the two countries' leaders confirmed their intention to strive to end the nuclear arms race on the earth and to prevent it in space.

[Kotyuzhanskiy] Yes, on coming up against American political reality, you see for yourself that Washington displays a manner of thinking which has long lagged hopelessly behind the process of profound changes in international life. [paragraph continues]

People there resort again and again to the myth of the "Soviet military threat" in order to conceal from Americans the real reasons for the present administration's policy and its desire to upset the established equilibrium of forces in the U.S. favor. This is precisely the aim of the numerous programs to create [sozdaniye] new kinds of nuclear weapons.

Another nuance is also curious. Whereas previously the United States always cited the problem of verification [kontrol] as the sole argument against concluding a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, now, after a whole series of corresponding Soviet initiatives (the Soviet press has written a lot about them, and in detail), that trump card can no longer be "played." So the administration has had to urgently draw up a new "rejection formula." President Reagan declared in the report sent to Congress 14 August, in particular, that a nuclear test ban should be viewed "in context with the time when the need to rely on the nuclear deterrent recedes...and when we achieve profound, extensive, improve the potential for carrying out verification [proverka], extend confidence-building measures, and achieve greater balance in conventional arms and armed forces." In other words, it is clear that the resolution of the question of ending nuclear tests is being postponed indefinitely, until the "Greek calends," as the saying goes.

[Ivanov] By the time the Soviet Union extended the moratorium, the United States had conducted 18 nuclear explosions but had only announced 15. Three tests were not officially reported. What kind of explosions were they, and houw were they recorded?

[Kotyuzhanskiy] During press conferences American journalists repeatedly touched on the question of those three explosions, emphasizing that the USSR had detected them solely with the help of its own national technical means of verification [kontrol] -- seismic stations which record ground vibrations or seismic waves which spread throughout the planet after a nuclear explosion, as well as with the help of space satellites. The American press later reported that the nuclear devices in question had been exploded in Nevada 15 August 1985, at the end of October 1985, and 20 April 1986. Their yield was low. The sum total of the circumstances of their detonation gives grounds for assuming that they were carried out within the framework of work on creating [sozdaniye] space arms. This viewpoint was express to American reporters who then literally bombarded the Pentagon and other competent federal departments with questions about this. In the end, seeking to break through such a siege by journalists, the administration was forced to confirm the facts that three nuclear tests, which it had previously hushed up, had been conducted. As for the purpose of the explosions in the Nevada desert, the administration continues to keep quiet about this.

[Ivanov] You have touched on the problem of verification [kontrol]. The Soviet side has repeatedly demonstrated that this problem does not exist at all. Incidentally, the fact that our specialists recorded three explosions not announced by Washington attests to the reliability of national means of verification [kontrol]. And the Americans undoubtedly possess corresponding means that are in no way inferior to ours.

[Kotyuzhanskiy] The United States not only possesses modern technical means of verification [kontrol] but also has a definite advantage in that area, since it obtains seismic information from almost 200 monitoring [kontrolnyy] stations located in various parts of the world, including along the perimeter of our borders. The Soviet Union's territory is fully "covered" by such stations. [paragraph continues]

According to American scientists themselves, the threshold for the detection of underground nuclear explosions on Soviet territory by such seismic devices is far below a yield of 1 kiloton. As you see, both our own and the American national means are perfectly adequate for effectively verifying [kontrol] the ending of nuclear tests.

In addition, the Soviet Union has expressed readiness to reach agreement also on international inspection [proverka] measures, including taking advantage of the proposal of the "Delhi Six" countries to set up special stations on their territory to observe fulfillment of the corresponding accord on ending tests. In the event of the United States' subscribing to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, the USSR is also ready to reach agreement on on-site verification [kontrol] measures. The setting up of an American seismic apparatus in the Semipalatinsk region within the framework of the experiment involving Soviet and U.S. scientists clearly shows the Soviet side's readiness for any constructive steps in the area of inspections [proverki] of the absence of nuclear tests.

And another thing. Following the press conference that I gave at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote: "...The administration believes that verification [kontrol] is not the key problem. But it has declared that the United States will not undertake to end tests even if the problems of verification [kontrol] are solved, since tests are needed to create [sozdaniye] new types of nuclear warheads...." In other words, the White House has been forced to acknowledge the invalidity of its basic argument, which it has long used to cover up a lack of political will in the matter of banning nuclear explosions.

[Ivanov] And a last question. These days the editorial office receives many letters in which readers ask whether our country's security is threatened by the silence on the Soviet nuclear test sites, while tests of American nuclear weapons are continuing in Nevada.

[Kotyuzhanskiy] American journalists put this question in a somewhat different form -- to what extent has the moratorium affected the state of Soviet nuclear programs? You will, of course, remember that, on commencing its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions 6 August 1985, the Soviet Union was forced to suspend its test programs. Subsequently, without corresponding nuclear tests, we were naturally unable to conduct work on improving our arms. But the country's security is our sacred cause. There are limits beyond which the USSR will not go, because it cannot forego its own security and that of its allies.

We still must not harbor any illusions about the Republican administration's position. However, the international realities of today must sooner or later impinge on the consciousness of the inhabitants of Washington's political Mount Olympus. At least, we would like to hope so.

World Opinion Cited

PM141238 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article under the general heading "Constructive Dialogue Needed": "Touchstone"]

[Text] On the day PRAVDA published M.S. Gorbachev's replies to questions from Z. Horeni, chief editor of RUDE PRAVO, I was flying back to Moscow from Harare. Consequently the ideas expressed in that document were added to my impressions of the nonaligned countries' forum, highlighting the indissoluble connection between the right to life and the right to development.

The arms race must be curbed, both to preserve life on the planet and to put an end to poverty and backwardness -- such was the main theme of the conference in the Zimbabwean capital. To prevent mankind's destruction as a result of nuclear war — this is a question which must be resolved, otherwise the posing of all other questions becomes senseless, R. Mugabe, the nonaligned movement's chairman, stated. He recalled that just one-fifth of the total annual military spending in the world would be enough to completely end hunger on our planet before the end of the century.

The leaders of almost 100 states who assembled in Harare welcomed the Soviet moratorium and urged Washington to follow Moscow's example. The idea was clearly expressed from the conference platform that the ending of nuclear explosions is not just a declaration but an action, and that the Soviet moratorium, extended now for the fourth time, is a political and military reality and evidence of the fact that the trend toward reason and common sense, a trend which can and must be consolidated, actually exists in world politics.

The mood at the nonaligned countries' conference illustrates the change which has taken place in world public opinion under the influence of the Soviet initiatives. The arguments in favor of going on with explosions have faded and withered like a fig leaf, revealing the opponents of the moratorium in all their ugly political nakedness.

Who will agree that the joint ending of tests cannot be verified if U.S. specialists are allowed to install their seismographs around the Soviet test range in Semipalatinsk (where, moreover, the only tremors recorded are those in Nevada), when Soviet scientists can detect from their territory even those U.S. explosions which the Pentagon does not want to announce?

Who will believe that the United States is forced to catch the Soviet Union up in modernizing its arsenals when it has already conducted more tests than all the other nuclear powers put together? (This is shown particularly graphically by the example of recent years: The USSR carried out 9 explosions in 1985 prior to the moratorium, the United States carried out 12. For more than 1 year now silence has reigned at the Soviet test ranges while in Nevada the number of tests in the same period is close to 20.)

Who will believe that you cannot be sure of the reliability of the existing arsenals without continuing tests? It is clear even to a nonspecialist that nuclear explosive is not some perishable product and that explosions are completely unnecessary to verify the other components. No words can conceal the main aim of the tests, which is glaringly obvious. It is to develop [razrabotka] new types of armaments. [paragraph continues]

Space-based nuclear weapons — X-ray lasers with so-called nuclear triggers — are being created [sozdavatsy]. Work is under way on preparing a completely new weapon, capable of striking targets both on earth and in space. Therefore, to claim that the ending of explosions will do nothing for the cause of nuclear disarmament is a hypocritical lie.

Hardly anyone will be fooled by the attempts to play off one side against the other: The argument is that the two powers had already "almost" agreed on a radical reduction of nuclear armaments when the Soviet moratorium interfered. That is not how matters are all all. Despite the USSR's efforts the sides have not moved an inch closer to an arms reduction agreement since the Geneva meeting. The U.S. Administration's actions have been in the opposite direction. There is the acceleration of the SDI and the other steps which undermine the ABM Treaty. There is the statement on withdrawing from the SALT II Treaty. There are the latest predatory "neoglobalist" actions against Libya, Nicaragua, and other countries. And there are the military maneuvers close to the Soviet Union — from the North Sea and the Baltic to the Far East — maneuvers unprecedented since the fifties.

In brief then, Washington has no convincing reason for refusing to join the Soviet moratorium — other than to admit that bellicose imperialist circles need nuclear explosions to upset military-strategic parity; and that they are being conducted to create a qualitatively new weapon with which the White House hopes to wage and plans to win a nuclear war — despite declarations on the impossibility of the former and the latter.

The attitude to nuclear tests is a touchstone on which the real essence and purpose of a nuclear state's foreign policy are judged. Those who strive for military superiority and who want to continue the arms race and extend it to space do not need a moratorium. A moratorium is a hindrance to those who are desperate for new, more sophisticated types of weapons, who profess the rule of force and who customarily resort to blackmail and diktat. A moratorium is unacceptable to those who fear honest competition with another social system in the sphere of the economy, democracy, and culture. Nuclear explosions are continued by those who do not care what happens to nature or to people's environment and for who the profits of the manufacturers of death are more important than the opinions and vital interests of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

Herein lie the reasons for the anxious silence with which Washington official circles greeted the new Soviet document. The Soviet leader's replies to the Czechoslovak newspaper and the facts and arguments that they contain are simply being ignored. And like so many times before, attempts are being made to divert public attention with some artifically exaggerated ballyhoo.

Washington surely does not lack experience of manipulating public opinion. Only on this occasion it will not succeed in fooling anyone. The attitude to a full ban on nuclear explosions has become in our day the most convincing indication of political leaders' approach to disarmament, international security, and the cause of peace. This is a particular test of historic maturity. And the Washington administration must take that test before the gaze of all mankind.

'Daniloff Affair' Distracts from Offer

LD121652 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] The latest explosion in Nevada is the 20th test of the U.S. atomic weapons since the Soviet moratorium began. I repeat, the 20th, for Washington has its own statistics according to which they attempt to conceal some of the explosions. As we can see, however, nothing comes of this. Scientists accurately record in any case the faintest rumbling in Nevada's underground galleries. In this way, each explosion, whether announced or not, clearly refutes Washington's statemeents to the effect that it is allegedly impossible to monitor a moratorium on nuclear tests.

Incidentally, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his answers to the questions from RUDE PRAVO, one might think of creating an international supranational network for monitoring a test cessation. Washington's statements about explosions being allegedly essential for checking the reliability of already existing nuclear arsenals do not bear out criticism. This can be done just as effectively and far more cheaply and safely by other methods. If the Americans have doubts about this our specialists, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev observed, are willing to share their secrets with them. But it is not really a matter of any kinds of secrets here: the Pentagon needs more nd more nuclear explosions to create new types of weapons, above all, weapons for basing in space. Naturally however,it is not easy to declare this openly, taking into account the feelings of the world public, including those of the U.S. public itself. So Washington is thinking up all kinds of excuses and seeking all sorts of pretexts in order to avoid accepting the Soviet proposal to end nuclear tests.

The so-called Daniloff affair is being used as one of these pretexts: Daniloff is a U.S. correspondent who has been detained in Moscow after being caught red-handed carrying out activities bearing no relation to journalism. In itself, this incident is fairly commonplace, particularly since even Durenberger, chairman of the Senate Committee on Intelligence, has admitted that the U.S. Secret Services make fairly broad use of journalists for their purposes. Nonetheless, an incredible hullabaloo is being whipped up in the United States over the Daniloff affair with the obvious aim of distracting attention from the USSR's peace initiatives and, above all, from our moratorium. But this, after all, once again confirms that Washington has no genuine counterarguments.

U.S. Arguments Rebutted

AU151419 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 12 Sep 86 p 6

[Article by Colonel Vasiliy Morozov, "Laureate of the USSR State Prize, APN Military Observer," written especially for RABOTNICHESKO DELO: "Truth and Lies About the Blasts"]

[Text] The declaration by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee of 18 August, continues to focus the attention of the world public. For the fourth time the USSR has announced that it extends its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987. This is further proof of the adherence of socialism, as a progresive social system, to the cause of peace. This is also a concrete action on the part of the USSR aimed at nuclear disarmament and liquidating nuclear weapons on earth.

Will the United States support this Soviet peace-loving step? Will it respond to the insistent appeal of the Soviet state to stop nuclear testing and turn the moratorium into a bilateral one, so that afterwards a treaty on fully stopping and banning these tests can be signed? One could say that these questions move the world's entire peace-loving public. It is clear to all that if the United States eventually takes this wise step, then the problem of nuclear tests will be solved forever, and will take its place on the shelves of history.

Unfortunately, throughout the entire period of the moratorium the official representatives of the White House and the Pentagon used and continue to use false arguments to justify in the eyes of the world public their unwillingness to join the moratorium.

The true emptiness of the U.S. "arguments" becomes clear as soon as one asks: Can the USSR be less concerned with its own security and the security of its allies than the United States? Every sober-minded person understands that this is not so. Nevertheless, the USSR considered it possible to halt its nuclear tests, repeatdly extending the term of its unilateral moratorium, and consistently and insistently striving to resume the negotiations on working out an international treaty on the total and general ban on experiments with nuclear weapons. As Mikhail Gorbachev stressed in his RUDE PRAVO interview, the attitude toward the moratorium reveals the real essence and direction of policy.

How does the United States respond? As before it tries to find a manner of diverting the solution of the issue, and continues to intensively implement the program of nuclear experiments set for this year. As early as 16 December 1985 the U.S. magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT very correctly noted in connection with the falsehood of the "argument" of the American strategists that the security of the nuclear potential must be guaranteed: "If no nuclear test were conducted in the United States in the next 100 years, we would still have 10 times more secure nuclear warheads than necessary for the extermination of this community" (meaning the socialist countries V.M.).

From a military-Technical point of view, at the present time there is no need to check the reliability of nuclear warheads through blasts. There are other means -- hydraulic-dynamic, through mathematical models, through an objective analysis of the data supplied by telemetric measurements, and so forth. The essence of the issue is that in 90 of 100 cases the nuclear tests are necessary in order to create new types and kinds of weapons.

By the end of 1985 the United States introduced into production eight types of new nuclear warheads. It is every clear that precisely this is the reason for the "argument" that is ostensibly connected with the concern with the reliability of the nuclear potential.

Also the thesis of the White House, that the USSR had significantly left the United States behind in the sphere of the tests, cannot be defended against criticism. The facts show that for the period of 16 July 1945 to 1 January 1986 the United States has conducted more nuclear blasts (810) than all other nuclear states put together -- USSR -- 563; France -- 135; Great Britain -- 38; and China -- 29. The number of tests conducted by the USSR and the United States in the previous 10 years (until 1985), is approximately equal -- 150 each, or 15-16 per year. At the same time, under Reagan's administration, the United States has tested 40 percent more nuclear charges than the USSR. At the same time, as the BALTIMORE SUN pointed out, the Pentagon has used data obtained from the 38 nuclear tests of its closest ally -- Great Britain. On the other hand, the U.S. plan is to conduct 16 tests until the end of 1986, while the program for the next 10 years envisages almost 1,000 blasts, with the view to work out the star wars technology.

The tales told in the West about the issue of verification are traditionally numerous. They present this issue as a reliable "brake" always when there is even a hint about bringing the positions closer together, or approaching an agreement. Simultaneously, the efforts do not cease to create in the public the impression that it is precisely the United States and its allies who support, and the USSR who opposes, verification, and that namely the "open position" of the West encounters an obstacle -- the "closed position" of the East.

The Soviet proposal to stop underground nuclear tests envisaged the use of various verification measures, both national and international, excluding any possibility of secretly evading the obligations undertaken. Therefore, Reagan's administration was forced to admit that essentially the allusions to the "necessity of effective means of ratification" as preconditioin for ratifying the previously signed treaties, and reaching new agreements, are nothing but excuses. Furthermore, the total ban on nuclear tests encounters political and not technical difficulties, because the present U.S. position in the military area aims at continuing the nuclear arms race. The USSR is convinced more than ever before that, given the modern level of technical means of verification, everything depends on the good will of the states to reach concrete results in limitng the arms race. Prctical means of verification, as Mikhail Gorbachev repeatedly stressed, can always be coordinted.

Among the statements of the opponents of the moratorium one can also encounter the argument that it contributes very little to the general plan of nuclear disarmament. Naturally, this is another falsehood. If the USSR limited itself only to the moratorium, then its role would not have been very significant. However, the USSR proposed the moratorium only as the first step -- which can be easily implemented from a technical and politial points of view -- that is necessary for stopping the nuclear conveyor belt. The next step would lead toward totally stopping nuclear tests under international control. Without new tests one cannot perfect the old weapons, nor create new ones. The banning of tests, stressed Mikhail Gorbachev in one of his statements, would mean the creation of a strong barrier on the road of further increasing the weapons of mass destruction.

Moscow Radio Talk Show

LD121826 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 12 Sep 86

[International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by foreign political commentator Vyacheslav Lavrentyev; with political observer Vladimir Shishlin, station commentator Yevgeniy Grachev, commentator Pavel Kasparov, station correspondent in New York Vladimir Zvyagin, and "colleague" Sergey Pravdin]

[Excerpt] [Lavrentyev] We start today's program with replies to letters which raise the problem of war and peace and the search for ways of curbing the arms race. Many listeners are quite right to link the solving of these problems with the need above all to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations. Letters from Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Tyutrin from Orekhovo-Zuyevo, Comrade Kochetov from Liev and others voice indignation at the obstructionist position of the Reagan administration toward our specific peaceful proposals and its unwillingness to be accommodating toward our initiatives. To judge by Washington's unfavorable reaction to our gesture of good will -- the extension of the moratorium on nuclear blasts -- writes Comrade Voronina from Moscow, the U.S. Administration is not interested in achieving a stable peace on earth. In that case,

is it worth having anything to do with it at all, she asks? I will ask political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin to reply to this and a number of other questions. Over to you, Nikolay Vladimirovich.

[Shishlin] These are of course serious letters, and serious matters are raised in them. It is not just Soviet people that are pondering these matters, but people in other countries also. But all the same, there are no simple answers to these questions, or rather there are no simplistic answers. If one were to adopt toward the present administration the stance that one cannot get on with it and that all that can be done is to wait for the next U.S. presidential election — to which almost 2 and 1/2 years remain — such a stance could not of course in any sense be called an active one. It is true, of course, that when we look, at the seventies, the foreign policy baggage of the seventies, we see that despite the fact that the U.S. Administrations were not very obliging during this period either, the 1972 treaty, or more precisely the interim agreement, on the limitation of strategic armaments was worked out, the ABM treaty of indefinite duration was concluded, and the SALT II agreement was worked out, though not ratified by the U.S. Senate. But during the 6 years in which the present U.S. Administration has been in office there has simply been no baggage containing any sort of agreement; there has been nothing. But they have destroyed quite a lot.

What should be done? People naturally raise questions over the fact that the Soviet Union takes initiatives and puts forward various ideas — compromise proposals, I might add, which take account of the position of the other side and the security interests of the other side — while the U.S. Administration turns its back on these proposals. In particular, as far as the moratorium extension is concerned, as was noted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorabachev, it has been declared that this is little short of propaganda. But this is propaganda by example, propaganda by concrete action, clear and comprehensible, and quite clearly directed toward halting the arms race and then going back to solve the cardinal problems which burden international reality today.

And now the question of whether it is worth having dealings with this U.S. Administration. It is unquestionably worth doing so. Yes, it is a hard-line administration, with all sorts of ideological prejudices, frequently in bellicose and militarist mood, and of course this defiant U.S. policy is lodged in the whole fabric of political and economic life of the United States today.

But to leave it at that and to consider that there is no common denominator in Soviet interests and U.S. interests would quite simply be incorrect. If nothing else, we have the common interest of working out how to survive, the need to survive, and not just o survive, but to learn to coexist peacefully, to learn to cooperate; and of course, mindful of its responsibility not just to our socialist friends but also to mankind, the Soviet Union must act responsibly, just as our state has acted throughout the already more than 8 months of 1986. Time is an asset which in the rapidly moving nuclear space age must be spent as economically as possible. Time must not be wasted. And that is why the active Soviet position — I do not want to say that it guarantees a new Soviet-U.S. summit in the near future — but this active Soviet position naturally fosters the smoothing out of Soviet-U.S. relations and an improvement of international relations as such.

[Lavrentyev] A number of letters, including one from (Peter Kuzmich Zavylov), a veteran of labor from Kemerovo, contain questions which boil down to the following. Don't Americans understand the full extent of the disastrous nature of the militarist course of their administration; why do they let Reagan pursue such a course?

[Shishlin] Well, there are of course different kinds of Americans. There are the people who are commonly labelled as ordinary Americans. There is the American political elite. And there is the military-industrial complex. And naturally different groups of the American population react in different ways both to Soviet actions and the actions of their own administration. I do not propose here to paint rosy pictures about the start of a change of mood in the United States. Regrettably, anti-Soviet stereotypes have become rather firmly lodged in the American consciousness. But something is nevertheless happening, something fairly perceptible. It is a fact, for instance, that when we first announced our unilateral moratorium, 3 or 4 months after the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium, if you had asked Americans whether they knew anything about it, it can almost be guaranteed that no one knew anything about it. It was simply hushed up. But now, when the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium for the fourth time, Americans knows the Soviet position.

Opinion polls show that roughly three-quarters of the American population wants nuclear tests banned. It is also noteworthy that the U.S. Congress, and in particular the House of Representatives, is quite officially calling on the U.S. Administration to agree to a moratorium on nuclear tests from 1 January 1987. Admittedly, it is not the same as our moratorium, it is not an absolute moratorium. They propose setting a threshold limiting the yield of nuclear warheads which are being — warheads would have to be less than 1 kiloton — and somehow to limit the number of blasts. Naturally this is not a radical solution to the problem, but this shows of course quite clearly that there has been acertain shift in the political awareness of even the U.S. House of Representatives. But there are also strong opponents. Of course the United States — and this is something that our listeners must be aware of — calculates that it will simply wear us out in the arms race, that it will exhaust the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. United States can force its way to military superiority and again the opportunity to orchestrate all developments on the world political scene exists.

Well, they naturally can not do this, but this situation is also a reality.

In other words, we are witnesses of a very bitter struggle in which the new thinking and the new approaches which have been so clearly announced by the Soviet Union are, with difficulty, breaking through the force of inertia and beginning to penetrate public awareness in other countries, including the awareness of the American public.

Foreign Journalists Round Table

LD132240 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 13 Sep 86

[Program titled: "The Main Topic Is the Soviet Moratorium," chaired by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, All-Union Radio and Television political observer, with journalists Shah Rajiv, identified as Indian publicist; Jack Phillips, from THE CANADIAN TRIBUNE; Atanas Atanasov, from Bulgaria's RABOTNICHESKO DELO; and Yuriy Aleksandrovich (Gremitskiy), identified as the chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry press Center; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Zholkver] Yuriy Aleksandr [Gremitskiy], it's not my intention to make compliments but, press conferences have been held at the Zubovskaya [Zubovskaya Ploshschad, the location of the Foreign Ministry Press Center] on a great many issues which have been raised here, above all of course, issues related to our

moratorium, which you yourself have conducted. Unfortunately, I was far from able to attend all of them and I think that it would also be interesting for our radio listeners to learn which, in your view, were the most noteworthy questions posed, not only by those journalists who are present here but by others at these press conferences.

[Gremitskiy] Indeed, there have been a whole number of press conferences of late at which the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the Ministry of Defense — that is politicians and military men and then specialists such as scientists and seismologists and many other specialists on the United States and its politics from the United States and Canada institute — outlined in a very orderly fashion our whole position and our stance in favor of a complete and universal ending of our tests.

The possibility was proved in a very clear, specific way at these press conferences of reliably monitoring the complete cessation of all nuclear explosions-even very small ones. Of course, in the handling, in those questions which journalists posed — the viewpoint of the particular journalist was revealed as was that of his press organ, television or radio station. The thrust of the social background which the journalist represents was also evident.

[Zholkver] As they say in English, who's who.

[Gremitskiy] Absolutely right, yes, and who is with whom. Let's say, well you are asking which were the interesting questions, but what was more interesting was the silence of the U.S. journalists. Particularly at the last press conference, the silence was so eloquent that, well, I won't assert that a direct stage-production is taking place as it were in the conduct of the U.S. journalists, but it is clear that at home they apparently don't charge them with throwing light on the position of the Soviet Union.

[Zholkver] Yuriy Aleksandrovich while you have been speaking I was thinking that we in radio and televison are actually faced with similar phenomena. In particular we wanted to hold a routine telebridge with the participation of major Soviet politicians from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, military men and experts and with the participation on the other side, of U.S. representatives and here also we met with silence, although one of the U.S. television companies was willing to do this. But representatives of the U.S. State Department stated in particular that neither Shultz, the secretary of state, nor his closest colleagues would wish to take part in such a telebridge with the Soviet colleagues, referring as they did so to the principle of confidentiality. What do you think of this?

[Gremitskiy] Yes, well they are hiding behind a formal argument if one may call it thus, and I say if one may call it thus, because it is no argument: Talks are, of course, confidential. In these talks, the sides expound their positions and attempt to move toward each other, having perhaps some kind of fall-back positions. One aspect of politics, however, is that these days it is impossible to just isolate somewhere, to cross out some where — because public opinion, the peoples throughout the world, want to know what kind of policy their governments are carrying out and what policies are being conducted by the governments of other states. They want to understand global politics. This is a new phase in the development of international life which we are presently observing.

For this reason it is necessary to explain this policy to the peoples and, so far as one is able to understand, the representatives of the U.S. Administration are afraid of appearing before the world public forum with an account of their true position, because

it will not be approved by the international public, and because the main thing about this position is not that it is impossible to prohibit nuclear tests because it is imposible to monitore them or because they are necessary for verifying [proverka] the reliability of nuclear warheads — all this is a lie which has already been proved to be such and hypocrisy.

The main thing is that they need nuclear explosions in order to develop new forms of weapons, but that is not an argument, indeed it is not a popular position.

[Zholkver] With such an argument...

[Gremitskiy — interrupting] No one will accept it [word indistinct]. [passage omitted]

Message to AFL-CIO

PM161428 Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Sep 86 p 1

["To Terminate Nuclear Tests. Message from the AUCCTU Presidium to the AFL-CIO Executive Council"--TRUD headline]

[Text] Esteemed colleagues!

We, members of the AUCCTU Presidium, address you, members of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, on a matter of exceptional importance.

As you know, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests was recently extended once more, through 1 January 1987.

It is our profound belief that, if the United States were to join the moratorium, a fundamental and specific step would be made toward laying a real foundation for constructive Soviet-U.S. dialogue, for movement toward universal, balanced, and verifiable disarmament.

We call on you to use all your influence to help in the making of such a step by the United States.

Addressing this message to you, we emphasize that we are motivated by awareness of the urgent need to achieve termination of the fatally dangerous nuclear-missile confrontation, and to curb the arms race which diverts enormous resources away from satisfying working people's vital needs, before it becomes too late.

USSR and U.S. trade unions operate under conditions of different socioeconomic systems, and this predetermines the differences in their priorities and methods of upholding working people's interests. But these differences must not overshadow the common fundamental interests of our trade unions' members: They all share one home--the planet Earth--and it must be saved from the threat of nuclear destruction.

The threatening growth of military danger dictates the need to overcome the barriers of prejudice and alienation which have been artificially raised between working people and trade unions of our countries. A dialogue leading to mutual understanding--this, in our opinion, is the way to organize cooperation between USSR and U.S. trade unions in the interests of Soviet and American working people.

This is why we address this appeal to you and hope that the AFL-CIO Executive Council will raise its voice together with the international public, which demands the termination of nuclear tests and subsequent resolute measures to ensure lasting peace, peace without nuclear weapons.

Summit Prospects 'Not Rosy'

LD150750 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Sep 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello comrades! Autumn 1986 promises to be a time when some important matters will be cleared up. And right now, it seems to me, the position of various states in relation to major international problems is becoming increasingly clear. What is usually called the moment of truth is here. And this is linked, of course, to the extension of the Soviet moratorium and all the ideas and views that were expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his replies to the questions of the chief editor of the RUDE PRAVO paper. You understand, of course, that at the moment the question involves not only halting nuclear tests but all of the ideas and actions of the USSR that are aimed at smoothing our international relations. The moratorium is a logical link in the chain of these actions. In talking about these actions and these ideas, I primarily mean the Soviet program to scrap nuclear armaments before the end of the present century, and the program to scrap chemical weapons and the bases for their production. Of course, one has to keep in one's mind the proposal of socialist countries for a considerable reduction in conventional armaments in the vast zone from the Atlantic to the Urals as well as the bold ideas relating to the strengthening security and cooperation in the Asian and Pacific regions, and, undoubtedly, the joint proposal of the USSR and other socialist countries to create an all-embracing system of international security.

These proposals, in essence, do not, of course, bear the nature of an ultimatum; they are open for discussion. But they require a certain consideration. And here, for instance, the monotonous no to the Soviet proposals which they are indulging in to excess in Washington, or the simple declaration that Soviet ideas are propaganda, are working less and less frequently. And it was no accident that this summer U.S. President Reagan, in describing the Soviet proposals for curtailing the arms race, said that it would appear from these proposals that there was an opportunity for a sudden change for the better in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, and he even called them ideas that signified a turning point.

But as for the actions of the United States, they are running directly counter to the words I mentioned of the U.S. President. What is more, this concerns the most recent actions. On 11 November [date as heard] the United States carried out the latest test of a nuclear device in the desert of the State of Nevada. This test was code-named Aleman. This is the 16th nuclear test that has been announced. But if one counts the unannounced nuclear tests in the United States as well, then this is the 20th nuclear explosion since the Soviet nuclear moratorium.

Of course, one has to turn one's attention to the fact that it is so obvious that the United States is now, in September, on the verge of very important events, striving to side step working out a mutually acceptable compromise on strategic offensive armaments. It is dodging a possible solution, both a broad one and an intermediate one, on medium-range nuclear armaments. And there is no sign of substantial changes in the U.S. position for the better, as far as other serious problems connected with limiting the arms race are concerned.

And therefore, for today — and one should be able to see things clearly here — one cannot call the prospects rosy. In the very next few days a meeting should be taking place between the Soviet minister of foreign affairs and Shultz, U.S. secretary of state. This meeting will show whether the United States is prepared to go to a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that will really yield results. And on the threshold of these very substantial, very important and significant conversations, one has to see, of course, that the United States has at its disposal many opportunities for putting a brake on the process of reviving detente. And nonetheless the United States does not have the right to veto all issues relating to world politics. A great deal depends right now on the active stance of the whole of the world community and undoubtedly on the position of the Europeans, on their ability to speak independently and with self-reliance. This applies to the whole of Europe and, of course, to Western Europe — and without doubt to West Germany.

Defense Ministry Spokesman

PM171314 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 14 Sep 86 p 3

[Interview with Colonel A.F. Kuznetsov, USSR Ministry of Defense spokesman, by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants: "Once More About the Nevada Explosions" — no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is a SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] The fact that the United States continues to conduct nuclear explosions in Nevada, despite the extension of the Soviet moratorium, causes universal indignation in the world. Colonel A.F. Kuznetsov, USSR Ministry of Defense spokesman, replies to SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA's questions about the nature and orientation of U.S. nuclear explosions.

[Dadyants] The attitude toward nuclear tests is now the touchstone of the real nature and orientation of any nuclear power's foreign policy. It is well known that the United States has carried out 20 nuclear explosions in Nevada while the Soviet unilateral moratorium has been effect. Initially they were justified by the alleged U.S. "lag behind" the Soviet Union, and later by the need to check the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal. To what extent, Arlen Fedorovich, are these arguments convincing or, more correctly, unconvincing?

[Duznetsov] The inconsistency of these arguments is proved by the facts. And the facts indicate that the United States leads in the number of nuclear tests, having carried out more of them than all the nuclear powers together. The Soviet Union started its test later than the United States, and by the day the moratorium was announced it had carried out one-third fewer tests. This is the second year in succession that the USSR has not carried out any nuclear explosions altogether. The gap in the United States' favor has thus widened further still. Let us turn to

figures. By the beginning of the year, according to data from the Swedish Defense Institute, the United States had carried out 807 nuclear tests against the Soviet Union's 563. These figures fit in well with data from London Institute of Strategic Studies. Nor have they been disputed in the United States. So, where is the "lag" of the United States?

The second argument is also inconsistent. Full-scale nuclear tests are by no means necessary for reassurance regarding the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal. The reliability of nuclear ammunition is basically determined by their nonnuclear components, which can be effectively checked by methods of "nondestructive" monitoring. For more than 10 years now, in accordance with the existing 1974 treaty, the USSR and the United States have not carried out any tests of nuclear devices with the yield in excess of 150 kilotons. Are they not, therefore, managing without testing by means of explosions the reliability of ammunition whose yield exceeds this "threshold?" After all, this ammunition constitutes the bulk of the sides' arsenals.

What all of Washington's "arguments" have in common in a desire to justify its refusal to terminate nuclear explosions. But it does not and cannot have any convincing arguments to this end since the termination of tests is a vital necessity.

[Dadyants] If existing types of nuclear arms do not necessarily have to be checked by means of destructive explosions, this means that the tests in Nevada pursue the goal of creating new charges. What are the Americans working out in Nevada? What is the real nature and purpose of their nuclear explosions?

[Kuznetsov] The nature and purpose of the explosions carried out at the U.S. testing range in Nevada leave no doubt that they are aimed not at checking the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal but at the development [razrabotka] of quite a wide range of new types of nuclear weapons. The U.S. press itself reports that the Pentagon is testing nuclear charge devices [zaryadnyye ustroystva] of warheads [boyegolovka] for the new MX ICBM which is currently undergoing flight tests, the Midgetman missile which is another new another new type of ICBM, and the submarine-launched Trident-2 missile; of warheads [boyevaya chast] for a new generation of strategic cruise missiles; and of more effective operational-tactical missiles and artillery, including neutron ammunition. A significant place in the U.S. nuclear test program is occupied by experiments for the purpose of creating [sozdaniye] so-called "third generation" nuclear weapons."

[Dadyants] The press, including the U.S. press, notes that some nuclear explosions in Nevada are designed for the implementation of lthe "star wars" program. As a rule, nuclear-pumped lasers are mentioned in the same breath. Are there any other types of nuclear weapons for "star wars" being worked out in the United States?

[Kuznetsov] It is known from foreign press reports that the United States is carrying out work within the "star wars" program framework to create [sozdaniye] a new type of nuclear weapons whose principle of operation is based on the transformation of energy particles emitted during explosion into a powerful guided stream of electromagnetic radiation, high-energy charged and neutral particles, or small-mass strike elements. Such a stream can cover large distances in space and strike various targets, including ballistic missiles and their warheads in flight trajectory.

These and other design concepts of guided-action nuclear devices are being tested in the course of full-scale nuclear tests in Nevada.

[Dadyants] The Americans have carried out 20 nuclear explosions but have announced only 16. Four of the explosions were "secret." What exactly were they, and how did we succeed in detecting them?

[Kuznetsov] For a long time now people in the United States have preferred not to announce officially any low-yield tests carried out in loose "soft" ground which absorbs well the explosion energy. In other words, they prefer to keep silent about tests which, in their opinion, cannot be firmly identified by seismological means. Probably the tests about which you are asking were of that kind. But the potential of seismological means is substantially greater now. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that national technical means for monitoring nuclear explosions both in the United States and in the Soviet Union are not limited to just seismological apparatus.

[Dadyants] Our newspaper's readers ask: Does the silence at Soviet testing ranges not jeopardize our security while tests of U.S. nuclear weapons continue in Nevada? How can we answer them?

[Kuznetsov] Of course, the refusal to carry out nuclear explosions cannot fail to affect the state of nuclear programs, and we halted their implementation as of 6 August 1985. With no tests of nuclear weapons, their qualitative improvement has been frozen.

The Soviet Union took this step because it wanted to use the power of example to influence the stance of other nuclear states, primarily the United States, so that the nuclear arms race would be halted forever and a practical step taken in the cause of nuclear disarmament.

It is, of course, impossible to advance on this path in isolatior and into infinity. They are certain limits beyond which we cannot risk our own security and the security of our allies. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasized, the country's security is our sacred cause. This must be clear to everyone.

U.S. 'Politicking' Hit

PM171021 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[V. Falin article: "Politics and Politicking"]

[Text] There has been total silence at Soviet nuclear test ranges for 14 months. Explosions have been rumbling constantly at U.S. test ranges for 14 months. The U.S. Administration refuses to the join in the Soviet "propaganda," as it terms the moratorium introduced by the USSR in summer 1985 and extended four times since then. That is how they operate -- they besmirch the ending of nuclear weapons tests and brand it a "deception" which is allegedly diverting attention away from matters in hand, while the continuation of American experiments with nuclear weapons is presented as a "contribution" to the efforts to curb the arms race.

Absurd, you say. Of course it is. But it is impossible to prove the unprovable without crucifying the truth. And the truth is being violated. All the more since this is a customary occupation for Washington.

Let us recall the reaction of U.S. leaders to the Soviet unilateral moratorium of 1958. Moscow is dealing in "propaganda," was the claim. The "perfidious Russians"

were planning to put the West in a detrimental position and ensnare it. The U.S. leaders claimed this as they tested new types of nuclear weapons with unprecedented intensity for that period. The Americans conducted more than 50 explosions that went unanswered at the time. Among the arguments against an interim or open-ended test ban were "absence of trust," "complexity of verification [kontrol]," and "asymmetry" of the sides' arms. For good or ill, Washington told the public, the United States and its allies have adopted nuclear weapons as the foundation of their military strategy and they are thus obliged to improve them and maintain them in a state of combat readiness.

In short, the main features of an almost 30-year-old show are currently being repeated overseas. It is as if the decades had left no mark on the United States and had not prompted the powers that by there to even ponder whether it was worth multiplying their mistakes and sticking stubbornly to their delusions.

The tests in the late fifties and early sixties initiated nuclear rivalry under water, raised the missile race to its current levels, and paved the way for the creation [sozdaniye] of many others arms systems that have made world peace so fragile. Everyone's peace of mind was lost. And nothing was added to the security of the United States itself.

For D. Eisenhower the abandoning of experimental nuclear explosions was tantamount to abandoning intercontinental weapons and the gamble on U.S. military superiority. The general-turned-President was not prepared to take a loftier view than his entourage, who were infected with nuclear fever. He merely branded them as the military-industiral complex. But what is in the mind of the present head of the administration? What visions would he regret or find hard to abandon? Revering his great trump card of "unpredictability," R. Reagan is in no hurry to show his hand. He keeps changing his mind depending on the prevailing fads on the Potomac at any specific time. There's no room for boredom.

When, however, it is not an individual but the policy of an entire state that is "unpredictable" it is no laughing matter. Political "unpredictability" is akin to willfulness and arbitrariness. How will it be possible to agree on anything if the "unpredictable" United States tomorrow eschews the commitments it adopts today whether with or without a pretext? But you will be told without batting an eyelid to take the Americans as you find them. You don't like them? Push off. The United States will get by without friends or partners.

This is a blatant anachronism. But entirely consonant with the neoglobalism logic. Those who intend to string the entire world along find friends a burden. Give them servants, retainers, and yes-men. They still adhere to the Old Testament interpretation of policy which V. Dal described in his famous "Dictionary" as: "The views, intentions, and aims of a sovereign, known to few people, and his mode of action that often obscures the same." So as to always have a free hand in everything.

The President never goes into the what, where, and when of matters, leaving that to his secretaries and advisers. They make no secret of the fact that references to verification [kontrol] and the need to test old charges from time to time or to "catch up" the Soviet Union -- which is allegedly far ahead -- and so forth are a banal smoke screen. It is used as a cover to milk the taxpayers. A smog of information clouds the horizon, stopping the "man in the street" from getting his bearings. At least it is meant to.

What do they talk about in their own circle? Let us turn to Congress protocols. There one can discover, for instance, authoritative testimony by Pentagon representatives to the effect that the United States is by no means behind the USSR. These representatives are concerned not about how to catch up with the other side but how to overtake it.

Many people, however, are well aware that Congress is not the place where the U.S. military-industrial complex goes to lobby. Tongues are really loosened when soul mates drink warming cocktails without any outsiders present. Or when they sit down to carve up the budget cake. It is then that it comes to light that it is not well-rehearsed tests that are taking place at the Nevada range but experiments with half a dozen of the latest types of nuclear weapons at the very least. In addition they measure the capability and potential for exploiting the energy generated during an explosion for use in fundamentally new military systems.

Beam weapons are one of the reasearch avenues, and by no means the only one. Nonetheless, the program to create [sozdaniye] a beam weapon is seen as a critically important component in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program. In the event of failure in this area the downfall of SDI as a whole is predicted. But since a nuclear-pumped laser cannot be built without explosions, the test moratorium gets a categorical "thumbs-down." Nuclear laser technology is still in its infancy. It will take a great deal of time and many nuclear experiments before it will be possible to ascertain whether the idea is feasible. How many explosions are planned? Various figures are given — ranging from several dozen to hundreds.

M.S. Gorbachev drew particular attention to the fact that weapons suitable for the practical waging of nuclear war are being developed during the tests. It is clear from materials that have been made public that underground explosions are being used to check the survivability of communications and homing devices and instruments for targeting nuclear charges themselves under real war conditions, as well as to check how the accepted norms and constructiive decisions in terms of means of passive defense, including ways of overcoming that defense, conform with new knowledge that has been acquired. Furthermore, considerable effort is being put into miniaturizing nuclear charges and making them lighter so as to obtain greater accuracy and range with the same yield from available launch vehicles. Finally, spheres are being sought for making effective military use of devices working on transuranic elements.

According to statements by staffers at U.S. nuclear laboratories, the catalog of models for the military use of the atom is as inexhaustible as the atom itself. Everything depends on orders and the amount of funds granted by the government. A phase shift measured in billionths of a second can turn one nuclear process into a quite different one. Instead of strike energy the weapon radiates neutrons or other elementary particles. There is truly endless scope for seeking even greater evil, as if what has already been found is not enough.

Even a summary or fleeting acquaintance with the agenda for the experiments that have taken place in Nevada or are still planned leaves no doubt: The people there are not just preparing for war, they are carefully forging and nurturing a weapon which would revolutionize military matters for the second time in 50 years. The United States miscalculated in its first stab at world domination. The nuclear monopoly turned out to be a venture with a short half-life. As a result the super potency [sverkhsila] left Washington in a dead end. Now an "absolute weapon" is being invented, which is meant to bring its possessor absolute power. It may be for a moment, but a moment is long enough to carry out what they have in mind.

No, the moratorium does not boil down to abandoning the nuclear arms race. [as published] It is not only weapons that are being tested in Nevada. The test range is also assessing and verifying the latest U.S. military concepts and conducting tests on the peoples' readiness to oppose Washington's imperial lust.

Consequently, ending tests is a military-technical problem which is to a great extent of key importance for solving the broader task of nuclear disarmament as specifically posed in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement. But it is also a political, legal, and moral problem.

It is political because mankind cannot and must not be hostage to any "unpredictability." International relations are not a continuation of domestic American upheavals and the infighting among U.S. monopolies. The peoples are justified in demanding clarity. THey have had their fill of declarations. They need peaceful actions.

Ending tests is a legal problem, primarily in the sense that the United States, the USSR, and Britain are obliged by treaty to strive to ban experimental nuclear explosions and wind down rather than whip up the spirals of nuclear rivaly. The day is coming when Washington and London, too, will have to answer to more than 100 states for having undermined the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

It is a moral problem because the planet has long been creaking under the burden of the weapons that have already been amassed. Soon there will not be enough room in Europe and a number of other regions to build additional mountains of arms and military hardware. It is time to stop before the irreparable happens. it is time to realize that each new system and weapon takes away part of the peoples' security and hope.

The duty of politics today is to turn the possible into the real, and to make the peoples' hopes a reality. This is directly contrary to the meat and drink of the politickers, who put a gloss of evil on everything. Things are too serious to allow people to knock the earth into a rash orbit. Common sense should suggest to all honest people where they stand at this crucial time.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1578

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER HITS FRG'S WOERNER REMARKS ON MORATORIUM

PM101359 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Sep 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel I. Voinov article: "Toeing the Line"]

[Text] FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner addressed journalists from the leading newspapers of NATO countries in Bonn the other day. The subject of his remarks was the Soviet Union's extension of the moratorium on nuclear explosion until 1 January 1987. The thrust of his remarks was militarist. The arguments were not his own, but American, and their correlation with the real facts which he cited was virtually nil.

Ignoring the international recognition and support for the USSR's new peace initiative, the leader of the FRG military department tried his utmost to find some way of justifying the U.S. Administration's latest hasty refusal to join in the Soviet moratorijm on nuclear tests. What did Mr Woerner tell the assembled journalists?

First he disconcerted his audience with "accurate" figures: In the last 15 years the USSR, he said, has carried out more than 315 nuclear explosions, and the United States 223. It is not known where Mr Woerner got these figures. But we would advise him to take a look at the well known figures from the Swedish Defense Institute. They show that throughout the years of nuclear tests there have been 810 nuclear explosions in the United States and 563 in the USSR. Mr Woerner could also have used the equally well known figures from the Stockholm Institute of Disarmament Problems: In the period from 1963 through 1970 the United States carried out 242 explosions and the USSR 85, that is, a ratio of 3 to 1 in favor of the United States. Nor did the speaker feel inclined to look at the latest figures: In 1985 the United States carried out around 20 explosions, while the USSR had carried out 9 explosions before the imposition of the unilateral moratorium 2 of them for peaceful purposes. Over the year of the Soviet moratorium the United States carried out 18 nuclear explosions. Woerner preferred to keep quiet about all these figures. Nor, of course, did he mention the official Soviet statement that 30 percent of all the USSR's nuclear explosions were carried out for peaceful purposes.

Woerner's second staggering (but not new) argument was that the USSR had supposedly completed the stage of modernization of its nuclear arms, and simply does not now need any nuclear tests. It is noteworthy that in expounding this "argument" the West German minister prudently avoided juggling with figures. Indeed, he openly cheated in citing the facts.

Talking about the modernization of the USSR and U.S. strategic arms, he recalled with difficulty only two American systems — the MX ICBM and the Pershing-2 medium-range ballistic missile, saying that nuclear tests have been carried out in the interests of

creating warheads for these. Let us remind Mr Woerner: Quite recently the United States tested improved nuclear warheads for the modernized Minuteman-3 ICMB, for the Trident-1 submarine ballistic missiles, and for the whole range of cruise missiles with every type of basing mode. Substantial groundwork was also done to provide nuclear warheads for the latest delivery vehicles, which include the Midgetman ICBM, Trident-2 submarine ballistic missiles, the SRAM-missile, and the second generation of cruise missiles.

One might ask Woerner: Where does he see a U.S. lag in relation to the USSR in the modernization of strategic arms? It is clear to any sensible person that there can be no question of a U.S. lag and that it is the United States which is continuing to act as initiator of the nuclear arms race.

Woerner made the quite absurd claim that the nuclear tests being carried out in the United States have nothing to do with the Strategic Defense Initiative program -- the so-called "star wars" program. You have to be very brave to set about refuting the irrefutable! After all, the very names of a number of the arms envisaged under the program, such as the nuclear-pumped laser systems, speak for themselves. They also show that in creating [sozdaniye] space weapons under the notorious SDI program you cannot do without nuclear devices, and therefore you cannot be covered by any kind of fig leaf, however hard yet another zealous supporter of American nuclear policy may try to do so.

The FRG defense minister lamented that the ending of nuclear explosions is not in itself a substitute for comprehensive nuclear arms reduction. That is, of course, a reasonable point — true, it is no substitute. But it can and must act as the first major step along the path of eliminating nuclear arms. Those who seek to bundle together the questions of ending nuclear explosions and comprehensive nuclear disarmament apparently want neither the one nor the other.

The FRG defense minister's zeal in "arguing" for the U.S. refusal to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions gives rise to both indignation and a legitimate question. Have his friends across the ocean instructed him to act for them on behalf of the European allies? Or is it perhaps his own initiative, looking very much like the loyal execution of Washington's desires?

In any event, Mr Woerner has done the cause of the lessening of international tension a disservice. Turning the question of a nuclear test ban upside down, he is basically trying to put barriers in the path of nuclear disarmament.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: KAZAKHSTAN EXPERIMENT SHOWS MORATORIUM VERIFIABLE

PM171008 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent A. Borovik "Reportage from the Soviet Nuclear Testing Range in Kazakhstan": "At the Epicenter of Silence"]

[Text] Semipalatinsk-Karkaralinsk -- An American political scientist remarked a few years ago that Ronald Reagan's presidency would go down in American history as "experimental." In the sense that various ultraconservative economic and political theories are being tested out in practice under it. Nevertheless, by an evil irony of fate, this prediction has now gained another, a sinister meaning: The United States has become undisputed champion in the sphere of testing nuclear charges. It has carried out 20 nuclear explosions in just the one single year of our moratorium.

Nuclear devices rumble deep underground in Nevada. But the detonator itself is installed in the White House. Official Washington rejects Soviet peace initiatives, one after another, with amazing speed. But this speed testifies not so much to the flexibility of political decisionmaking there as to the instant effect of the reflex of rejecting any disarmanent measures.

A most acute shortage of logical arguments to justify the fact that the United States is not joining the Soviet unilateral moratorium has come to light in Washington now. The problem of verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka] was dragged out yet again. "They want" M.S. Gorbachev noted in his replies to questions by RUDE PRAVO's chief editor, "to extend the life of the bankrupt argument that a nuclear test ban is supposedly impossible to verify [prokontrolirovat]. It is bankrupt primarily in the light of scientific successes." Eloquent evidence of this has already been provided by the very first results of the ongoing Soviet-U.S. experiment on the verification [kontrol] of the nonconduct of nuclear tests. Scientist carrying out the experiment in Kazakhstan, not far from the Soviet nuclear testing range, have registered explosions at the Nevada testing range. The accurate instruments captured seismic waves which traveled for 13 minutes through 14 time zones.

Soviet and U.S. seismologists are working in Karkaralinsk. One wing of the "Shakhter" rest home, situated on the shore of a picturesque mountain lake, has been placed at their disposal.

The noise level here is low, I was told by Feliks Semenovich Tregub, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute. This is why it is easy to isolate the effective signal. And the granite rocks which reach through to the surface are good conductors of underground impulses and waves of any origin.

Furthermore, Karkaralinsk is situated next to the Soviet nuclear testing range. This is the first time U.S. specialists have been given an opportunity to study seismo-geological conditions in this zone.

The experiment is now in its first stage. Surface seismographic stations are located around the testing range. They are equipped with highly sensitive instruments: Even people's steps are registered, let alone nuclear explosions!

In the course of the second stage instruments will be installed in wells to a depth of 60-70 meters. This will make it possible to reduce to a minimum any wind, rain, or other interference.

Once a week the U.S. specialists visit the observation stations and change tape recorder cassettes and power batteries. Each of the recording instruments sited here covers its own frequency band. Afterward these data are summed up by processing apparatus. A special recording device "reads" them off the magnetic tape at the laboratory. The deciphered information is stored in computer memory.

Successes in the seismology sphere, U.S. scientist David Chavez said, today make it possible to use national means to detect even low-yield nuclear explosions on foreign territory and distinguish them from distant earthquakes.

I hope, his colleague David Carrell added, that the results of the joint experiment will be used in the interests of disarmament.

Those who advocate a bilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions are persecuted in the United States, D. Chavez went on. As soon as it became known that I intended to travel to the USSR to take part in the Soviet-U.S. experiment, I was submerged in a stream of poisonous jokes and insults. An acquaintance of mine, with whom I had hitherto maintained normal contacts, came up to me and said in a deliberately loud voice for everyone to hear: "What is this people say, that you are on your way to your second home?!"

Unfortunately, D. Carrell remarked, to judge by everything, the Reagan administration not only does not intend to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, but is striving in every possible way to do everything within its power to ensure that America gets used to the need to continue nuclear tests.

The Soviet scientific delegation which will travel to the U.S. nuclear testing range in Nevada 14 September will be headed by Igor Leonovich Nersesov, chief ot the Seismology Department at the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute.

While in Nevada, I.L. Nersesov said, we will have to resolve tasks similar to the ones being performed here, close to the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing range. [paragraph continues]

In the very near future we will have to select three locations to drill wells near the Nevada testing range and install surface instruments. It is envisaged to hold a Soviet-U.S. conference in Colorado which will discuss questions concerning the continuation of our joint experiment. We plan on completing the drilling of the wells themselves by the beginning of next year. We hope that the Soviet-U.S. experiment will make it possible to take a major step along the path of improving seismic monitoring methods. U.S. scientists have been given a unique opportunity to "record" the Soviet moratorium in regions directly adjacent to our testing range. You have seen for yourself that seismic equipment is already operational here. But will USSR specialists be given similar opportunities and conditions in Nevada?

This was the question I asked when I telephoned Jim Boyer, U.S. Department of Energy spokesman in Nevada.

"USSR specialists in Nevada?" Boyer asked. "First I heard of it."

There is nothing amazing in this answer. The U.S. authorities and mass media have done their best to keep silent about the experiment. Or, more accurately, to silence it by nuclear rumblings in Nevada. It became clear that Mr Boyer is equally ignorant about his compatriots working at present near the Soviet testing range in Kazakhstan.

"Interesting, and what are they doing over there?" My transatlantic interlocutor said with skeptical curiosity.

I had to tell Mr Boyer briefly about the nature of the current experiment and the fact that U.S. scientists are "recording" the silence at our testing range and the explosions at the Nevada range. At the same time I asked the Department of Energy spokesman whether he had heard of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

"I have heard of the moratorium," Mr Boyer assured me. Nevertheless, he refused outright to tell me what he personally thinks about the importance of the large-scale Soviet initiative.

"My thinking is done in Washington," Boyer explained. "Here in Nevada we only execute their decisions. You know, we are outside politics...."

A rash statement: For the second year in succession the Nevada testing range has been at the very epicenter of politics. It is the Nevada range that shakes international relations. It is there that people are making vain attempts to undermine peace, stability, and the peoples' hope for disarmament. This is why every test in Nevada generates a mighty explosion of protest all over the world and in the United States itself.

"We do not pay any attention to these peace lobbyists," Washington's spokesman parried. "They really don't know what they want. There can be no more than abou 300 of them in America. It is stupid to consider the viewpoint of a microscopic minor !"

Minority? The latest opinion polls show that the overwhelming majority of Americans believe that the United States must join the moratorium. Authorities in 175 cities, counties, and states have signed a resolution demanding of President Reagan to join the Soviet Union's initiative. Residents of Alaska voted for a freeze on the nuclear arms race and a reduction of nuclear arsenals at a referendum held there.

A 58-percent majority also voted in favor of a demand to local authorities to aim for the introduction of a joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on the deployment of nuclear weapon systems. Some 700 participants in a Peace March which started from Los Angeles adopted a 10-point action program. It contains, in particular, a call for a complete nuclear test ban on U.S. territory.

To put it briefly, by continuing the modernization of the nuclear potential, the Washington administration disregards the viewpoint of what is far from a minority of Americans. Moreover, every time the authorities respond with repressions to peaceful demonstrations by protesters. Specifically, a group of fighters for peace, protesting against the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada, were arrested quite recently. Does this mean that the U.S. freedom of speech does not extend to Nevada?

"Our democracy," Mr Boyer enunciated clearly, "extends to all states in the country without exception. We have set aside a special area for demonstrations here. It is forbidden to go beyond its boundary. Thus, we arrested them not for protesting but for going outside the area allocated for the purpose."

I asked:

"Is that area large?"

"200 meters by 200 meters. Exactly."

...Whatever you say, U.S. democracy is a handy thing. And the main point — it is compact: Just 200 meters by 200 meters!

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S PETROSYANTS HOLDS GENEVA PRESS CONFERENCE ON MORATORIUM

LD151915 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 15 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva, 15 Sep (TASS) -- The issue of halting nuclear tests is a kind of a touchstone by which the foreign policies of all states, both nuclear and non-nuclear, are being tested at present, Academician Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Utilization of Atomic Energy, said at a press conference here today. Having extended for the fourth time the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987, the Soviet Union is creating favorable conditions for reaching a full and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests as a realistic measure for curbing the arms race and for disarmament.

A. Petrosyants stressed that the halting of tests constitutes today not a military-technical but a political problem. It is technically possible to ensure reliable registration of [registratsiya] even small explosions. This view is shared by a majority of scientists and specialists from all countries. The Soviet Union has already said that it is ready for monitoring, including on-site inspections.

Proceeding from this, the USSR has positively replied to the proposals of the "Delhi Six" to take part, together with experts of these countries, in resolving questions of monitoring a halt of nuclear tests in the USSR and the United States. The Soviet delegation has proposed to the U.S. side in Geneva to respond positively to this proposal. However, there is still no reply from the United States.

A. Petrosyants noted with regret that the U.S. side does not show efforts toward the necessary flexibility and compromise. As previously, U.S. representatives are pursuing a course toward the continuation of tests and not toward halting them and the corresponding monitoring.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

GORBACHEV FIELDS QUESTIONS ON TEST MORATORIUM

17 September

LD180254 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 17 September in the "Vremya" newscast carries a 25-minute video report on CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Krasnodar Kray 17 September. The passages within quotation marks are recorded.

The announcer opens his report with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's arrival in Krasnodar, where he was met at the airport by Comrade Poloskov, first secretary of Krasnodar Kraykom, Comrade Shcherbak, chairman of the Kray Executive committee; and members of the Bureau of the Party Kraykom. On his way to Timashevskiy Rayon, Comrade Gorbachev stopped in Novotitarovskaya Village.

Gorbachev then addressed the crowd and subsequently fielded questions:

"[Man] "Tests, how will things go from here with atomic explosions?"

"[Gorbachev] For the time being, things will be the way I have said, and it was only a few days ago that I said it, you know, that we are still looking at the United States, so that when we reckon that there (?are none) there...

"[Man, interrupting] And if they agree to...

"[Gorbachev, interrupting] Then I shall tell you...(Gorbachev's words are drowned out as crowd breaks into laughter) What am I to do, you want to find out before everyone else! I approve of your interest, and it is correct that you are interested in foreign policy. This policy is needed by us, just as all peoples need it. In the first place, there is danger for everyone in conditions of nuclear weapons."

"As far as our policy is concerned, all the same we are still reckoning, you know, on what is even a natural instinct of people for self-preservation, if not on the political wisdom of the leaders; and now there is such a wave of pressure on those quarters that still want to continue the arms race, and it is growing. We will not be changing our policy. But that does not mean we will beg anyone (?in the world). It does not mean that we will start disarming unilaterally. That would be absurd. Maybe that is just what they want, to give us commands, to dictate to us -- but they cannot do it at present and we will not permit anyone to dictate to us. At the same time, we are in favor of talks and of disarmament -- and of good relations. We have a policy, we have a fine people, we have an enormous country with its resources, we have an enormous base on which we can build realistic plans and strive to (word indistinct)

them, and so peace is a benefit for us from this point of view as well. And we don't have to implement such a policy through military power, of plunder, plunder of other peoples -- No, we are doing everything depending on our own resources, and on the potential of our order, our system. So, we will pursue a confident and strong foreign policy. We won't make it (word indistinct), full of rows, it should be serious, just as it ought to be on the part of the Soviet Union, the first socialist state, an enormous state, and hence with enormous responsibilities. I wish you all the best.

18 September

LD182000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Remarks by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee made during an 18 September walkabout in Revolution Square in Krasnodar Kray, in response to questions from unidentified members of the public -- recorded]

[Excerpt][Unidentified speaker] Mikhail Sergeyevich, we doctors, like no one else realize the consequences of any war, never mind a nuclear war. That is why it is becoming particularly disturbing now when we hear that nuclear tests are still going on in Nevada. What, in your view, are the prospects for Soviet-America relations in this question in the long term?

[Gorbachev] This is the most difficult struggle we are waging -- the struggle for peace. Previously, they explained away all their militaristic plans by many inventions, many distortions about the image of the Soviet Union and its foreign policy. First of all, there was this: The Soviet Union threatens to conquer the whole world; The Soviet Union is striving for military superiority; The Soviet Union is preparing to occupy the whole of West Europe; The Soviet Union wants to put its clutches on Africa, on Asia. However, you know, the image they depict -- this, as they call it, the Russian Bear, the Russian aggressor. Looking at you, it seems to me, surely you and I don't give such an impression?

[Unidentified speaker] [passage indistinct]

[Gorbachev] People, all our generations which have suffered through all that has happened in our country, and we are proud of it, although we can see all our problems and shortcomings. [sentence as heard] We have given so much effort and given our lives, surely we could not devise such insidious plans, terrifying plans, in regard to other peoples? Raisa Maksimovna and I have sometimes read Dostoyevskiy, and he said -- the words are there -- that it is, perhaps, the Russian heart, but I would say the heart of the Soviet people, that is the most open now to fraternity and unification.

We invite with our peaceful foreign policy to unite people in order to save life on our planet, and to prevent not only a nuclear war but also so that ecology does not destroy the lives of people. The world possesses resources to solve the problem of poverty, and especially to end the arms race. They say that every year 400 billion, or possibly 500-600 billion [currency not specified] are spent on the arms race; but to wipe out poverty as a priority task requires 100 billion, 200 billion. So, that means 1 year could be used if the funds are there to solve the question. So, we now -- and yes, they said something else -- the Soviet Union is against any kind of monitoring, you cannot get to them to agree, they don't observe agreements. You can see all these fabrications of theirs, they have been exposed. We have proposed such a policy in all directions, and it is difficult to argue that it is not peaceful, and difficult to deny.

People now do not want to believe that the Soviet Union is engaged in propaganda and that strives for war, and the more they travel here and get to know our Soviet people, the more they find them kind, peace-loving, hospitable, ordinary and open. In many American circles -- one of our Doctors of Philology returned after lecturing in something like 22 universities, and American scientists and representatives of the American intelligentsia said that Russia today remains the last reservoir of spirituality. So, people are beginning to find out what sort of country we are, what sort of people we are, what we think, what our dreams are, and what we strive for.

This is what we are implementing in our foreign policy, and this is the strongest -- the mosst progressive foreign policy must rest on a firm basis. This is the reality from which there is also no escape, but that I mean: a powerful economy, a cohesive people, and a strong defense. All this is in our hands. All that we have planned, we will do: This will solve all our tasks, domestic ones too, and will strengthen our foreign policy.

It is not easy to try to reach agreement with representatives of the militarist circles, but the American people and all other peoples also have an interest in peace.

That is where we proceed from, and we count on the fact that people understand well enough that we must preserve peace.

Yes, please.

[Unidentified speaker] We speak softly to people abroad. Do we perhaps speak too softly with them?

[Gorbachev] You know, this is how we conduct our principles: Conduct a firm policy, defend principles, those I have just spoken about, but do so in a constructive manner. One must show restraint [vyderzhka]. You know, it is not being soft -- one must have firmness, restraint, and restraint is not softness. Let them make frantic moves, and they do make frantic moves now.

They dream up things, like time they let powers loose in order to wreck the thaw which had come about in Soviet-American relations. Then there was the Korean plane, you know, when the world also began to think about getting back to detente. Now they have raised the Daniloff affair, a spy who has been caught red-handed, who engaged in espionage matters. You have probably read all about it. he had been to many places, including not far from you. He engaged in these matters, close to the center. But they want to call this a run-of-the-mill affair, espionage is no run-of-the-mill business. Nevertheless, in comparison with all international policy, relations, this whole complicated business, this, of course, is a common event, but they have turned it around in such a way as to again damage and sow doubt in the Soviet Union's policy, to damage its image, the image which people, especially in the United States, were beginning to understand, and simply reap a harvest of hatred toward us.

So will we get nervous? We won't get nervous comrades. No, we won't. They will not provoke us. I understand that you want the Soviet Union to be strong and resolutely pursue its peace-loving policy. I understand you. It is a proper thing to wish for.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1579

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES U.S. PEACE GROUP ON TESTING PROGRAM

4 Sep Test Information

LD080723 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS -- The "American Peace Test" anti-war organisation has thoroughly examined the information in its possession, compared it to the news coming from other organisations and government agencies and announced that the United States had carried out a new nuclear weapons test at a test range in Nevada in the morning of September 4, says a dispatch carried by "PRAVDA" today.

A nuclear device was detonated in a deep vertifical pit at square 19 and in its yield was equal to an underground tremor measured 3.5 on the Richter Scale.

Under the "calender" of the U.S. energy Department this explosion was staged as part of the secret military research conducted by the Los Alamos Atomic Laboratory in New Mexico, the test was agreed to be titled as "Galvestone".

So, the United States set off the 19th nuclear device after the Soviet Union had announced the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts, the correspondent writes.

As has already been noted on more than one occasion this year, there was no report on the test in mass media.

"PRAVDA"'s correspondent placed a long-distance call to Las Vegas where the "American Peace Test" is headquartered. The call was answered by Jesse Cox, the organisation's national coordinator.

She said that a news blackout imposed on all information relating to the developments at the nuclear test site in Nevada could perfectly be explained. The administration does not want the U.S. public to be reminded once more about the ongoing U.S. nuclear tests. She said the organisation was also forced to check its information through other channels, including sources in the energy department and other federal agencies.

Upcoming Tests

LD100628 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 10 Sep 86

[Text] San Francisco September 10 TASS -- Representatives of the U.S. anti-war movement report new nuclear tests planned by the Reagan administration. According to Jessie Cox, national coordinator of the American Peace Test Organization, the next test is scheduled for September 10. It was condenamed "Alamon".

Another explosion of a nuclear device is to be conducted on September 26. Three more tests are scheduled for October. In December the U.S. is going to conduct the nuclear test similar to the "Mighty Oak" test conducted in April which resulted in a substantial leakage of radioactivity inside the underground test complex in Nevada.

IZVESTIYA Observer's Comments

LD082126 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1701 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 8 Sep (TASS) -- Commenting on the latest, the 19th nuclear explosion carried out by the United States since our country declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, IZVESTIYA political observer Vikentiy Matveyev writes today:

The public and governments, advocating a halt to nuclear tests (and they are the overwhelming majority), will doubtless draw conclusions from what is happening to the Nevada desert. The indignant reaction in the world to the madness of the atom-makers is capable of trumping even the most thunderous explosions of the weapons being tested in Nevada.

The struggle goes on. It will intensify. "Our task now is to convince the U.S. people and those who represent them that a mutual Soviet-U.S. ban on nuclear explosions meets the interests of the United States and also the citizens of all states. We U.S. physicians, must convince our citizens that on this issue national patriotism and universal humanism fuse into a single powerful torrent," indicates a telegram by Bernard Lown, cochairman of the international movement "physicians of the World for the Prevention of a nuclear War," which was sent to M.S. Gorbachev following his 18 August statement on Soviet television.

According to the latest information, the IZVESTIYA observer goes on, 56 percent of the U.S. people support the idea of the United States joining the Soviet moratorium. And this is in spite of the unbridled campaign of intimidation of ordinary people which official propaganda is conducting in its attempts to paint a terrible mythical picture about what would allegedly happen if there were no more nuclear tests. There are two Americas. A United States of conscience and good will and a United States of the evil of militarism.

We believe in the wisdom of the U.S. people and of all mankind, Vikentiy Matveyev writes in conclusion. Time is not on the side of the atom-makers, no matter how much they may arm themselves against the demands of the millions. The Nevada explosions will not remove from the agenda the question on which the very existence of our planet depends. This is being realized more and more clearly by masses of people throughout all continents. And here lies the great strength of the peace-loving initiatives which are dictated by a sense of responsibility for the destiny of mankind.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV: 2 SEP PRESS CONFERENCE ON VERIFICATION TECHNIQUES

LD022311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1838 GMT 2 Sep 86

[Text] A press conference took place today of Soviet scientific experts on monitoring the cessation of nuclear tests. This is one of the most acute questions, which has been something of a stumbling-block in international politics for 20 years now, since the time of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in space and under water. Is the prob'em of monitoring merely--a pretext or really a complicated scientific and technical problem of the present day?

Opening the press conference, Gerasimov, the head of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, introduces the prominent Soviet scientists who are ready to reply to journalists' questions. They are: Academician Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Gokhberg, acting director of the Earth Physics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Neresov, corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences; and Kokoshin, deputy director of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin recording] [Velikhov] Today there really is an historic opportunity to quickly put an end to the testing of nuclear weapons once and for all. The cessation of nuclear tests is the central question, the question of creating a more stable world and of safeguarding stability and security in the process of the transition from the nuclear world to the non-nuclear world, as is stated in the 15 January 1986 proposal of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

As before, there exists the argument about it being difficult to verify today, with the existing methods, the fulfillment of an agreement on the complete banning of nuclear tests. It has to be said that this argument is today refuted by the unanimous opinion of the entire geophysical world community of Western and Soviet scientists and scientists from other countries. Arguments are put forward to the effect that tests can be conducted in remote space, behind the sun: Tests can be conducted of very small warheads dispatched there by means of a space apparatus. These arguments are absolutely far-fetched and we can also give you information about what we think of such kind of arguments. They say that it is possible to create very complicated technical devices which completely, so to speak,

eliminate the emission of acoustic or seismic waves caused by very small explosions. Again it can be said what kind of a monumental structure is necessary to create for this in order for this to be of some substantial significance and how easy these structures and their creation can be verified by other methods, by means of reconnaissance from space, etc. [end recording]

There was a question from a GDR journalist.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified GDR journalist] Yevgeniy Pavlovich, you said that all the techniques exist. Can you state what techniques the Soviet Union has for precise monitoring and what techniques the United States has.

[Velikhov] The Belomorsk laboratory has put forward the thesis that theoretically it would be possible to conceal a nuclear test by creating a large underground hollow some place and by conducting tests in such a hollow. It must be said that in this case today we have at our disposal: Firstly, with the utilization of high-frequency methods we see that such a use of a hollow proves considerably less effective than if we use old types of seismic equipment. Changing over to higher frequencies on a scale of 30-40 Hertz, it turns out, makes it possible to detect substantially better the explosions which are carried out in hollows. But, apart from that, today, over these past 20 years, the system of surveillance from space of any activity being conducted in any country of the world has been substantially developed. And by means of the space system of surveillance, of national means, it is certainly possible to verify the fact itself of the creation of such a huge hollow, since work comparable with the work to create an Egyptian pyramid is necessary. For this reason, the creation of such a large system for the concealment of nuclear explosions lends itself wholly to verification by other methods.

[Gokhberg] The latest experiment which now is being held with our U.S. colleagues in Semipalatinsk is aimed at studying the finer details, that is, the seismic sounds, both of natural and artificial provenance, so as to separate out a useful signal from the background of these sounds with complete clarity, that is, that is increasing the quality, [corrects himself] improving the accuracy and quality of detection of the separation of the signal from the background of interference. Thus, even the smallest explosions will not go unnoticed. Naturally, everything about the diverse geological structures at the testing grounds can be learned by means of this experiment which is now being conducted by the Institute of Earth Physics of the Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Council for the Preservation of Natural Resources.

[Unidentified speaker] Bulgarian news agency. A month ago it was said at a press conference here that this fall Soviet seismographic equipment would be installed near the test site in Nevada. When will this be, and what is the attitude of the U.S. government?

[Neresov] During the talks on the conducting of analogous work in Nevada and in the Soviet Union an agreement was reached that work would begin in the Soviet Union in the area of Semipalatinsk, and a little later it would be got under way in the area of Nevada. At the present time, a trip by a Soviet delegation to the United States is proposed, where specific issues on the installation of equipment on the territory of Nevada will be discussed. At the present time two Soviet-U.S. stations are already in operation on our territory, and a third station is probably at this moment being assembled--as we are holding this press conference--and this for the moment is the first stage of work on the installation of surface equipment. A little later, in November, when borehole equipment will be ready, it will be installed in boreholes. Preparations for boreholes are now underway at the Semipalatinsk test site. In the United States we have to agree analogous questions and commence work, it would seem, somewhere around January-February 1987.

[Unidentified speaker] Czechoslovak news agency. What scientific significance for the development of fundamental research does the Soviet-U.S. experiment in Semipalatinsk have?

[Gokhberg] For working out methods not only of monitoring earthquakes but also for working out new methods of forecasting earthquakes, especially operative methods of forecasting which would enable the time of an approaching earthquake to be determined within hours, which is very important inasmuch as it would be possible to get the people away, switch off power systems, and the equipment which will be set up on the territory of the Soviet Union and on the territory of the United States will of course make it possible to speed up the time taken in solving such complex problems, for example, as these.

[Neresov] No less interesting, too, are the questions connected with the study of the structure of this region, with the aid of surface and body waves. One other task which emerges here is the study of the lines of Nevada and Semipalatinsk which are in the very deep parts of the earth, and the structure, pecularities and time changes. Our earth is living all the time, and this experiment may show the nature of life on earth as of our planet as a whole.

[Unidentified speaker] Soviet television, the "Vremya" program. Please comment on the present objections by the Americans of a scientific-technical nature, so to speak against quickly joining in the moratorium.

[Velikhov] In a whole series of speeches by representatives of the official U.S. Administration--for example, there was a speech by U.S. Energy Secretary Herrington--Herrington put forward the completely--in my view--absurd idea that, it turns out, the main reason is that the United States wants to be certain about what the Soviet Union can achieve by creating and testing such weapons. The answer to this would seem to be very simple: Join in the moratorium immediately. The Soviet Union has not been testing anything up to now anyway, for a year. After that all nuclear

tests in the Soviet Union and the United States will be stopped. Then there'd be no reason to worry about what could be achieved by creating these third-generation weapons.

[Kokoshin] What Yevgeniy Pavlovich spoke about, the moratorium and a complete ban on all explosions, these are measures which can substantially restrict the development of those means which could be seen as a first-strike means, as a means of a disabling strike, as a compact, high-precision means which are designed, according to the plans of some U.S. theorists, as it were, to inflict surgical strikes, to conduct all kinds of exchanges, so to speak, which would lead, perhaps, to a total exchange and to the utter destruction of our civilization. So, the Soviet position with regard to a ban on nuclear explosions goes completely in line with our position whereby we have made the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and that our nuclear forces are nuclear forces for restraining war and not for waging war. And we are definitely in favor of halting, and then, so to speak, going below the threshold which has been achieved, and to halt the development of these nuclear arsenals. I would like to draw attention to yet another aspect of Soviet military thought and of Soviet military doctrine which is at odds with what we have on the other side of the ocean, the aspect of a limited nuclear war. It has been said clearly by some of our top military theorists and military commanders, and it is written down in our Military Encyclopedia, that we reject the idea of a limited nuclear war as unrealistic and very dangerous.

[Unidentified speaker] The (DANA) agency, Argentina. The leaders of the Delhi Six made a specific proposal for cooperation in implementing the monitoring of nuclear tests. In what form and at what level is such cooperation possible? Do you have ties with the scientists and scientific organizations in those countries, and will there be discussion of this issue at the Conference of the Nonaligned Countries?

[Neresov] The fact is that national means, although they are perfectly adequate to carry out monitoring on other countries' territories, can be stepped up by distributing additional monitoring stations over the whole territory of the globe.

[Velikhov] I would like to add specifically this. In May this year we invited representatives from the six countries, specifically Indian and Swedish scientists, to the seminar, the first seminar we had for scientific discussion of the possibility of cooperation with U.S. scientists, and they were present at our seminar, and so they were fully informed about the Soviet-U.S. cooperation. Then there were representatives of all the countries present at the forum, they took an active part in it and also discussed these problems. And so, Soviet scientists, the Soviet Union, are completely open to international cooperation and participation concerning development of facilities for reliable confirmation of a complete end to nuclear tests.

[Unidentified speaker] TASS news agency. Why did the Soviet side agree to the use of U.S. equipment in both cases for this experiment?

[Gokhberg] This decision was made at a joint conference of Soviet and American scientists. The use of a single type of apparatus immediately clears away a whole range of contentious questions. The point is that Soviet and U.S. apparatus have different degrees of sensitivity. Therefore, if both Soviet and U.S. apparatus were used it would have been necessary to compare this apparatus and calibrate it. At that time the U.S. apparatus was ready and we agreed to use it, all the more so since the geological conditions at the Semipalatinsk test site and the Nevada test site are different. Therefore, there are different apparatuses and different geological conditions. Thus, it would have been rather difficult to solve the task of isolating the signal against background interference.

[Gerasimov] I have here a question in connection with this. It is from TASS.

The question is now being discussed in the United States: Are the Russians not gaining more than the Americans from the joint experiment? What is your opinion?

[Gokhberg] Well, this question does not occur to scientists. The whole experience of our work with the Americans, with our colleagues, shows that everyone gains. In this case there is a gain for universal trust, for trust between our countries. It is considered that the U.S. colleagues have access to the holiest of holies--the Semipalatinsk test site--where Americans were not previously permitted; that they will have the opportunity to calibrate the entire seismic channel from Semipalatinsk to Nevada; that the Russians in this case are gaining more in political matters.

Well, I can cite--I cannot remember who said this, I think it was Paul Bodin--one of the participants in the experiment. When the U.S. apparatus was set up and a few days later our American colleagues registered an underground explosion in Nevada, they said that we, as engineers, as an engineer I am pleased that our apparatus is working well, that we have tested and proved it, but as a citizen I am ashamed that these waves are coming from the territory of the United States. Of course, we would like our scientists to hear silence both at the Semipalatinsk test site and at the Nevada test site.

[Gerasimov] I think that it will be earth physics, science, that gains most.

[Gokhberg] Science always gains.

[Unidentified speaker] The newspaper KOELNNISCHER ANZEIGER, FRG. Is it conceivable that there can be some explosions, some tests for military aims, whose strength is so low that it is impossible under current conditions to verify or to determine over a certain distance?

[Neresov] Explosions of up to one kiloton are easily detectable both by national means and even more so by the establishment of stations on the other's territory. We have rich experience, as does the West, in registering small charges. There is the well-known method of deep seismic sounding which is widely used in the USSR and in some Western countries by which explosions of two to three metric tons [repeats emphatically] metric tons can be registered at a distance of up to 1,000km--500 to 600km--and in individual cases, up to 1,000km. Therefore, (?existing) stations are capable of registering very small charges at quite great distances. A seismological bulletin issued in Britain constantly reports industrial explosions of 20 to 30 metric tons detected by the network of normal stations, not special detection stations. Therefore, these figures should show that it is possible to register and record very small charges, that is, at the level of industrial quarries and at various industrial establishments. To speak of the difficulty of detecting explosions of one kiloton as the Americans do when they raise the question is at the least extremely unwise in a scientific environment.

[Velikhov] I would like to add that, as I have already said, to create [sozdaniye] third generation weapons it is necessary to have tests of the order of a hundred kilotons or tens of kilotons. Judging from statistical analysis, it seems that to improve nuclear weapons, active use is made of tests in the 10 kiloton range. [end recording]

The questions of scientific and technical progress are closely linked with political questions. Journalists asked Andrey Afanasiyevich Kokoshin to elucidate this theme.

[Begin recording] [Kokoshin] Recently we were at a seminar in (?Harwich) where we were confronted with this position in its most naked form on the part of representatives of the Livermore Laboratory, or those of its sections that are working directly on the creation [sozdaniye] of new weapons systems. Their thesis, as it were, was that the frontiers of science are boundless and in particular that it was impossible to halt military-technological progress, and no matter what we say or think, all the same, new weapons systems will be created [sozdavat]; and it is important only to, at best, regulate this business in some way. But this line is being met with increasing incomprehension and opposition on the part of the broad public.

[Unidentified speaker] NHK, Japanese television. It is now being said that the installation of equipment in the USSR and the United States is cooperation between individual scientists, not governments, at government level. Are you undertaking measures to raise the level of cooperation in this field at government level?

[Velikhov] We are ready to cooperate with both governmental and non-governmental organizations in order to reach the right goals. If there are now some governmental organizations in the United States that are prepared to participate in this cooperation, please come forward, we

are always ready. We have not had any restrictions. We have never put the question in such a way that only non-governmental questions could cooperate. As far as I understand from the existing literature--but I cannot guarantee that this is so--it seems that there has not been any real permission from the U.S. Administration for scientists working in governmental organizations to participate in this cooperation. There has been no such permission. Therefore, there are certain restrictions in the United States. But we have never imposed such restrictions. If the National Academy of Sciences or any other organization is prepared to cooperate with us on this we are always open to this. [end recording]

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA REPORTS ON LUGAR SOUTH PACIFIC TRIP

'Anti-Nuclear Feelings in Region'

PM091302 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Aleksey Ivkin "Commentator's Column": "Opposite Effect"]

[Text] Another "government inspector" from Washington has arrived in the South Pacific. This time it is Richard Lugar, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His trip begin in Australia. The senator set about lecturing to the Australians and the leaders of other countries in the region on how to combat the "Soviet threat." Washington's envoy does not like the package of Soviet peace proposals with regard to this part of the world. He even sees a "threat" in the USSR's purely peaceful cooperation in the fishing sphere with some of the island states here.

But Washington is particularly alarmed by the increasingly clear antinuclear feelings in this region. A noticeable manifestation of those feelings was provided in particular by the conclusion last year of the "Avarua treaty" on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. Ten countries have signed this treaty and 4 have ratified it since the 17th session of the South Pacific forum held on Fiji recently. Whereas the USSR and PRC have clearly supported the nuclear-free zone being created here, the United States (plus Britain and France) have raised a large number of objections to it.

The Australian Government welcomed the Soviet Union's extension of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions to the end of the year and supports the conclusion of a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear tests. From the White House's viewpoint, Canberra is "not behaving as it should" toward New Zealand. The latter refused to allow U.S. ships armed with nuclear weapons into its ports and Australia, you see, is absolutely avoiding condemnation of it.

In Canberra Lugar again foisted on people the view that the South Pacific countries cannot do without the U.S. "nuclear umbrella." He declared that the nuclear-free zone treaty of 13 South Pacific forum countries is "illogical."

The United States has other reasons to be displeased. It has become accustomed to impudently exploiting fish stocks even in the coastal fisheries of the states in this region. This causes the latter great harm and they are acting in defense of their just economic interests. Washington is also angry at the heightened differences of opinion with Australia in the agricultural sphere.

In general terms, "government inspector" Lugar was clearly sent to lessen the negative impact of the course which the United States is stubbornly pursuing. But by all accounts his trip is not particularly successful.

New Zealand Ship Calls Policy

PM091549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent O. Skalkin report: "Unceremonious Visitor"]

[Text] Wellington, 4 Sep -- For some time, or, to be more precise, since the time of the New Zealand Labor government's proclamation of its nuclear-free policy which closed the country's port to American nuclear ships, the United States has been conducting a ceaseless propaganda campaign against Wellington. The remarks, orchestrated from across the ocean, criticizing New Zealand policy often attain the pitch of psychological warfare, violating the norms of the customary relations between independent states. More and more frequently, official American representatives are going over the heads of the New Zealand government to appeal to the country's public.

That is how one can assess the statements made by Richard Lugar, chairman of the U.S. Senate International Relations Committee, who visited the New Zealand capital in recent days. Clearly abusing hospitality, the senator permitted himself to make flagrant attacks on D. Lange's government, thereby spurring on internal opposition to him. Thus the decision to turn the South Pacific into a nuclear-free zone, supported by New Zealand, was described by the senator as a "hare-brained scheme."

Nor did he waste the opportunity to talk about the notorious "Soviet threat." Since he did not and could not have any arguments to support this so-called thesis, Lugar resorted to malicious insinuations.

The American visitor's unceremonious attacks aroused indignation in many inhabitants of the country. A wave of commentaries and readers' letters protesting about this has reached the pages of the newspapers here.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

DANISH PARLIAMENTARIANS, SOVIET OFFICIALS DISCUSS KOLA PENINSULA

PM020750 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 28 Aug 86 p 2

[Carl Otto Brix dispatch: "Folketing Chairman in Soviet Union: No Debate on the Kola Peninsula"]

[Text] Moscow--The Soviet authorities are totally unreceptive to suggestions for talks on a link between the Nordic area as a nuclear-free zone and the Soviet military buildup on the Kola Peninsula.

This was made clear by leading political and military figures to the leadership of the Folketing, which yesterday held talks in the Kremlin. "It is mostly old-style Russians [gammelrussiske] we have met in our talks here," Folketing Chairman Svend Jakobsen said after yesterday's talks. However, after yesterday's talks he was most positive about the atmosphere in which the talks took place, but when the politicians touched on the Soviet Union's military interests there was no responsiveness.

One of the Defense Ministry's top officials, Vitaliy Ganzha, declared that the idea of the Nordic area as a nuclear-free zone is an excellent one, but there can be no suggestion of negotiations with the Soviet Union until the zone has been established.

The Folketing deputies were also told that the Western threat and the constant expansion on the part of NATO in northern Norway, for example, make the Soviet Union's measures necessary.

Those involved in yesterday's talks also included State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control Chairman Yuriy Izrael, who told the Danish guests that reactors 1 and 2 at Chernobyl will be started up again this fall. Reactor 3 will be subjected to some further investigations before it can be started up again. It was in reactor 4 that the catastrophe happened, and this reactor is now encased in concrete. Izrael did not think that a special agreement needs to be signed with Denmark providing for warnings in the event of a nuclear leak.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

CSSR: SEMIPALATINSK TEAM STATES NO NUCLEAR TESTS HELD

LD121814 Prague CTK in English 1309 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Text] Karkaralinsk, Kazakhstan, Sept 12 (CTK correspondent Vaclav Frank) -- U.S. and Soviet seismologists David Chavez and Vladislav Martynov, manning a scientific monitoring station at the Soviet test site near Semipalatinsk, agree that it can be stated with certainty that the Soviet Union is carrying out no tests of nuclear weapons at the site.

As a group of Czechoslovak journalists visited one of the monitoring points at Karkaralinsk today, they learned that scientists at the station had already obtained several hundred data on various natural seismic phenomena and industrial explosions. Though it is not the purpose of their measurements, they also registered two nuclear blasts made by the United States in Nevada on July 17 and 22. All readings are being processed by computers. As David Chavez, of Nevada University, stated, information obtained on the geological conditions near Semipalatinsk enables American scientists to additionaly analyze readings of nuclear tests carried out in Semipalatinsk before the declaration of the Soviet moratorium, and thus see that the Soviet Union had not breached the agreement limiting the strength of underground nuclear blasts. The first stage of the Soviet-U.S. project to monitor nuclear explosions is culminating in Kazakhstan as readings from seismological equipment on the earth surface are being analyzed.

The Karkaralinsk station began to operate on July 12, and instruments now also work in Bayan-Aul in the Pavlodar region. Another station is to start working at Karasu near Semipalatinsk. Preparations are culminating for the second stage during which instruments will also work in 100 metres deep pits. Soviet specialists have already completed a pit at Karkaralinsk, and at the two remaining sites boring is to be finished by the end of September. Installation of the apparatuses, which will be brought by American experts, and their putting into operation is planned for October.

Karkaralinsk, Bayan-Aul and Karasu were jointly selected by U.S. and Soviet experts. All are within a 200 km distance from the Semipalatinsk testing ground. The Soviet-American experiment will continue similarly in the United States. On Monday, a group of Soviet experts led by Professor Igor Nersesov is leaving for the USA to select the sites for monitoring stations and discuss the details of installation of scientific apparatuses.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

JAPAN'S FOREIGN MINISTRY WELCOMES USSR TEST BAN EXTENSION

OW200609 Tokyo KYODO in English 0550 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo, Aug. 20 KYODO -- Japan welcomes the recent Soviet announcement of an extension of its unilateral freeze on nuclear tests until next January 1, a senior Foreign Ministry official said Wednesday. But the official added, "the moratorium does not mean a final solution to a total nuclear test ban," and called on the United States and the Soviet Union to make further efforts to bring about a total ban on nuclear tests. "It will be necessary for the U.S. and the Soviets to begin taking actions toward a total test ban," the official said.

The official further stated Japan welcomed a recent meeting of U.S. and Soviet experts in Russia on nuclear tests, terming it a step forward towards a test ban. Japan hopes that similar meetings between the two countries will bring positive results, the official said.

The Soviets unilaterally declared its nuclear test moratorium on August 6 last year on the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima in 1945. The latest extension is the fourth since then.

/8309
CSO: 5260/131

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE: SECURITY, TEST BAN, SDI

LD112120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1440 GMT 11 Sep 86

[Report by Andrey Ptashnikov on the 11 September news conference held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center, chaired by Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, with Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, and USSR Foreign Ministry officials Valentin Vladimirovich Lozinskiy, Vsevolod Leonidovich Oleandrov, and Gleb Aleksandrovich Smirnov. Questions by correspondents are in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation.]

[Text] [Gerasimov] Esteemed comrades, ladies and gentlemen, there has been a Soviet Government decision confirming the delegation of the USSR to the 41st Session of the UN General Assembly that starts soon in New York. Heading the delegation is Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs; Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, deputy head of the Soviet delegation, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; Valentin Vladimirovich Lozinskiy, Vsevolod Leonidovich Oleandrov and Gleb Aleksandrovich Smirnov, deputy members of the Soviet delegation and senior workers of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs have come to meet you today to discuss matters related to the forthcoming session of the UN General Assembly. Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy will have the first word. Please.

[Petrovskiy] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, comrades. The 41st session of the UN General Assembly opens on 16 September in New York, the most representative gathering of states in the world. The Soviet Union is going to this session with a comprehensive program of practical action to remove the nuclear danger, to curb the arms race and preserve and strengthen universal peace. Our country, guided by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, is putting forward to the world community new ideas and fresh approaches directed toward building a guaranteed peaceful future for all peoples of our planet, a future without wars or violence. We consider it exceptionally important that both the discussions and the decisions of the 41st UN General Assembly Session, which, as you know, is convening in the final stage of International Peace Year, should be marked by a new political way of thinking that is fit for the requirements of the nuclear and space era.

The proposal for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security which, as you know, a group of socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, has, in timely fashion, submitted for the examination of the forthcoming session, is an expression of such a new way of thinking. The implementation of this initiative would foster a refashioning, in a revolutionary nature, of the political awareness and modus operandi of states. The purpose of this initiative is to decisively end confrontation and the arms race, and unite the efforts of all states with the aim of creating a

system of peace characterized not only by the absence of war, but by ruling out the threat of an outbreak of war and reliably ensuring equal conditions of security for all in any sphere of international relations. The moratorium on all nuclear explosions are convincing evidence of the new and bold approach of the Soviet Union to international affairs. Being not a declaration, but action, the moratorium has become an inalienable political and military reality of the modern world.

We consider that the United Nations, by means of its collective authority, can and must promote a situation in which the renunciation of nuclear testing is translated from a political slogan into reality.

The Soviet Union wants the coming session of the UN General Assembly to provide an impetus for progress in the nuclear, chemical and all the other areas for limiting armaments and for disarmament under the strictest monitoring, including on-site verification in the necessary instances. We want the funds released in the process of disarmament to be directed exclusively to constructive purposes, including aid to the developing countries. We are also putting forward specific peaceful alternatives to military programs -- the peaceful use of space, of nuclear power, and of chemical science. Our approach to the session is aimed entirely at honest, constructive, and responsible dialogue, at joint search for answers to burning questions in the interests of world security, trust, and international cooperation. The Soviet Union is fully determined to strive to see that in our complex and contradictory, but at the same time mutually dependent world, the United Nations becomes an important instrument for such a joint quest and becomes a genuine center for coordinating the actions of all states, as envisaged in its charter.

[Gerasimov] May we now have your questions, please?

[Correspondent] Polish radio and television. At the 40th UN General Assembly session on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the problem of international cooperation in the field of the peaceful utilization and conquest of space was included in the agenda. The unilateral moratorium is in force, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is proposing the creation of an international monitoring system for the conduct of nuclear explosions. What are you able to say in detail at present about the next stage, so to speak, in the USSR peace offensive at the 41st UN Session?

[Petrovskiy] The Soviet Union intends at this session to launch an extensive peace offensive. For this purpose we are armed both with a new political philosophy for survival and also with a platform of specific actions. This platform of specific actions encompasses virtually all spheres of international relations, including the political, military, economic and humanitarian spheres. The sense of this platform is that the time has come to go over from words and declarations to specific and really tangible deeds. And our unilateral moratorium on nuclear test, which has already surfaced several times, is in particular, as I have already said, an example of this approach -- not a declaration but an action. We are also ready for action in other directions, linked with the strengthening of world security. It is exceptionally important that the UN General Assembly -- that unique, universal forum expressing the interests of the entire world community -- should create what I would call an appropriate international life. for this, it is necessary to totally renounce attempts to use this forum for purposes of confrontation, and set about coordinating action in all areas and drafting a common position.

[Question] Kobayashi, Japanese NHK television. Will the meeting between Shevardnadze and Shultz take place as planned? That is the first question. And the second question is: The Soviet Union has stated that the arrest of Daniloff should not affect mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. In order to avoid any negative effect, what measures is the Soviet Union prepared to take?

[Petrovskiy] I must reply to the first question first. The Soviet Union's position is that the meeting planned for 19-20 September should take place on the set dates. On our side there is no obstacle to this meeting being held.

As to the Daniloff affair, our position is that we are not making Soviet-U.S. relations the hostage of such a case. You asked about the Daniloff case, and I would like to say to those correspondents present in this connection that the U.S. side, those who ought to know, know perfectly well that Daniloff is being called to account on the basis of the law. There is evidence and material for this.

I should also like to stress that the possibility of a settlement undoubtedly exists, and incidents of this kind in interstate relations, and in particular in Soviet-U.S. relations, should not hamper the development of those relations.

As to the Soviet side, I must say that we are doing everyting possible to achieve this, and I can say that contact has been established with the appropriate and competent U.S. organizations, and everything now depends on the U.S. side. But, I beg you to understand me correctly, gentlemen and comrades: I would prefer not to go into detail as this would stoke up even more the already artificially whipped up hue-and-cry surrounding the Daniloff case.

Disarmament to us is above all a means of ruling out any possibility of material preparation for war, and of creating the peaceful conditions for the life of our people and for the life of the people of the entire planet. In particular our position is that the process of disarmament should be accompanied by the release of funds saved for purposes of development. And in this connection we consider that there are corresponding peaceful alternatives in all areas where the arms race and military programs exist.

Take space, for example. The United States is now doing their utmost to extend the arms race into space, and thus effectively draw the world into a new and far more dangerous spiral of the arms race. We, on the other hand, are putting forward an alternative to star wars, the alternative of making peaceful use of space. And this alternative is not mere words. It is a specific program, drawn up in three stages. You know, it was set out in our message to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar. As a first stage, we considered it possible to convene an international conference at the beginning of the nineties to consider comprehensively this program of action for peaceful use of space, and set up a world space organization to coordinate the activities of other states.

[Ptashnikov] Next came a question from a correspondent for the U.S. television company CBS. He enquires about the goals being pursued by the Soviet side as it approached the meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze, the USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state.

[Petrovskiy] We consider such meetings important in as much as they not only provide, so to speak, a survey of the state of affairs. They also map out prospects for the future. For this reason I stress that this meeting is of great importance. Of late we

have had a whole series of meetings between experts. We consider that these meetings have been useful. I would say that we have checked the timing of our political watches in all areas. Here and there we have tried to clean up the clockwork mechanism a little, but I must say that we have not been able to achieve synchronization of our watches.

We consider that the plans involved in the Strategic Defense Initiative are, basically, plans for star wars. You well know the essence of these plans, which is to create a space shield -- vain attempts, I would say, to effect a first nuclear strike with impunity. And the participation of this or that country, in particular Japan, certainly does not promote the interests of peace and disarmament, since the SDI program threatens to plunge us not only into an arms race, which would in this case be of an uncontrollable nature. It also threatens to increase the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war.

[Question] A question from NOVOYE VREMYA: On the subject of the Soviet peace offensive, I would like to hear your appraisal of the international reaction to the latest interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in RUDE PRAVO.

[Petrovskiy] Even today, even though only a little time has elapsed since Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement, we can say Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement on questions related to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has had a broad international echo. I think that the reaction to our statement on this matter now gives us grounds to speak of a kind of trial by moratorium, a test of maturity, the political maturity of states. Paraphrasing a well-known Russian aphorism, I think we may say: Tell me what you think of the moratorium, and I'll tell you who you are -- friend or foe of the cause of peace.

In this connection a highly typical feature which is now emerging in international life is that the watershed in attitudes toward the Soviet moratorium runs not along any political, ideological or social framework. Rather it runs between those who have adopted stances of common sense and political realism, and those who are guided by ideas of force and count on force as the last resort in world affairs. I believe that there are, nonetheless, grounds for expecting good sense to tip the balance eventually, and that as a result of this general support for the idea of ending tests, the nuclear-free hour will at last draw nigh. [An abbreviated version of this press conference was also carried by Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1445 GMT on 11 September 1986.]

/12858
CSO: 5200/1576

RELATED ISSUES

AUSTRIA'S VRANITZKY WRITES TO GORBACHEV ON ARMS ISSUES, SDI

AU181015 Vienna NEUE KRONEN ZEITUNG in German 16 Aug 86 pp 2-3

["Exclusive" report by Kurt Seinitz]

[Text] Vienna/Moscow — Last Wednesday, 13 August, Chancellor Vranitzky sent a letter to Kremlin leader Gorbachev, thus answering a confidential Gorbachev message of 14 July. The exchange of letters between the two heads of government deals with the tug-of-war in disarmament between the two superpowers and the verification and supervision of proposed disarmament agreements.

President Reagan in particular insists on "on-site" verification and supervision. In this connection an interesting idea for a compromise has emerged before the CSCE conference, which will start in Vienna this fall: The four neutral European states — Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland — could conduct such verifications of troop and arms reductions on site as a new version of the "Four in the Jeep," so to speak.

Vranitzky now sent his answer to Gorbachev: "Austria welcomes with particular satisfaction the fact that this year developments have occurred which make it appear more probable that the questions of adequate verification, resulting in connection with disarmament agreements, can be solved in a satisfactory manner. Austria believes that neutral states can play a special useful role in this area and is ready to accept such tasks if it is asked to do so."

Concerning the arms race of the superpowers, Vranitzky's letter stressed Austria's point of view that a worldwide peace can be maintained only in case of a balance of armaments at the lowest possible military level.

Without expressly naming Reagan's SDI project, the chancellor clearly speaks against unilateral armament initiatives of this kind: "In Austria's opinion, it is urgently necessary to avoid everything that would lead to unilateral steps which will then result in autonomous armament measures by the other side. Austria welcomed your proposal for a fixation [festschreiben] of the ABM Treaty for a specified period as an important contribution to finding a solution by means of negotiations."

In his six-page letter to Gorbachev, Vranitzky extends Austria's concern about the danger of nuclear radiation from the neighborhood and to the nuclear arms stockpiled in Austria's neighboring countries.

Everyone in Austria is aware of the fact that our permanently neutral state is located in the middle between the two strongest military alliances in world history. It is understandable that the Austrian people are particularly interested in eliminating nuclear arms deployed in our immediate neighborhood."

/8309
CSO: 5200/2771

RELATED ISSUES

FRG DISARMAMENT OFFICIAL HOLDS TALKS WITH GDR'S FISCHER

LD101745 Hamburg DPA in German 1540 GMT 10 Sep 86

[Excerpt] East Berlin 10 Sep (DPA) — Within the framework of the consultations between the two German states on disarmament questions, the disarmament representative of the Federal Government, Ambassador Friedrich Ruth, had talks in East Berlin today with GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer and Ambassador Ernst Krabatsch, director of the Basic Questions and Planning Main Department in the Foreign Ministry.

The meetings between Ruth and Krabatsch, who last met in Bonn in February, are part of the Federal Republic's dialogue with Warsaw Pact states on arms control issues. In the talk with Fischer, who was the first to receive Ruth, there had been no new points of view, it stated. In this connection, it was noted that Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Minister in the Chancellor's Office Wolfgang Schaeuble had spoken with Krabatsch in the previous round.

In today's exchange of views — the fifth meeting between Ruth and Krabatsch — the present efforts toward arms control, including the topics being dealt with by the United States and the Soviet Union and in particular the state of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence Building and Disarmament in Europe, were discussed. The Stockholm conference consultations are to end next week. Particular importance is attached to its results with regard to further developments in the efforts for conventional arms control in Europe. [passage omitted]

/8309
CSO: 5200/2772

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S ARBATOV EXPLAINS NEW SECURITY POLICY

AU091724 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 3 Sep 86 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute at the USSR Academy of Sciences, given to Nina Vasilkova, Moscow correspondent for NOVOSTI — date and place not given]

[Text] [Vasilkova] Georgiy Arkadeyevich, you participated in the discussion and preparation of the basic party documents determining the strategic line in our country's development for the period up to 2000. How would you describe the esential character and the innovations in the USSR's foreign policy line?

[Arbatov] The Soviet Union not only came out with numerous peaceful proposals, but it also addressed the peoples of the world with a document of a basically new character — a document which is purposeful, which represents a specific and comprehensive concept for ensuring international security.

The search itself carried out in the USSR in this direction led to the conclusion that the very approach to the problems and to our way of thinking should be changed. Is it not true that the search itself, unfortunately, is destined to lag behind the rapidly changing facts of reality? We in the Soviet Union not only called upon others to overcome this gap between the real world and the idea of it, but we began to adapt facts to the new requirements, above all in the military and political spheres. In drawing a conclusion from this process, we proceeded with our initiatives. They reflect our present idea of the threat, our idea about how mankind should live today in order to avoid a nuclear disaster. I will recall the basic aspects of our proposals.

They stem above all from the fact that the security problem, in its very essence, is a political problem and that it cannot be resolved by military technical means alone. The appearance of new types of weapons has transformed military power into a genuine boomerang, also affecting those who have recourse to it. It has become evident that not the arms race but disarmament alone can strengthen security.

We are guided by the fact that in the nuclear century we cannot build security at the expense of or to the detriment of the other side. This security can only be mutual — if we mean relations between the USSR and the United States — or common, if we are talking about the entire international situation. Security today can only mean security for all. In our century the issue is: equal danger and equal security — for everyone.

We think that it is necessary to become aware of the truth that the world has become very complicated. The world is in a process of constant change which no one is able to stop; no one can establish a status quo. The legitimate interests of almost 200 states meet one another on the world scene. These are both political and economic interests. If the national interests of the individual states are not respected, no real security can exist. At the same time, all states and peoples in our world, despite the existing differences which divide them, must learn to respect not only their interests but also the interests of the others. They must learn the science and art of peaceful coexistence, the science and art of practicing restraint and self-control, as well as tact on the international scene. They must learn how to live in a civilized manner, under the conditions of relations and cooperation based on equal rights.

In other words, the contemporary world has become very small and vulnerable; it does not permit any wars and any policy of strength. We must resolutely and once and for all put an end to the outdated ideas and actions which throughout many centuries relied on the possibility and admissibility of waging wars and of practicing the arms race.

All proposals of the Soviet Union are based on the aforementioned thoughts. Their nuts and bolts consist in the program of gradual nuclear disarmament and full banning of nuclear weapons, submitted by Mikhail Gorbachev in his declaration of 15 January 1986. This Soviet initiative is not an ultimatum but a potential basis for serious negotiations, a basis for future dialogue. We are also ready, in the course of the negotiations, to analyze most carefully all proposals of other countries.

[Vasilkova] What can you say about the reaction to the Soviet proposals in the West, especially as regards the United States?

[Arbatov] A rather strange development occurred in this case. Broad public opinion, including that in the United States, supports our ideas. However, in the government circles of certain states, especially in the U.S. Administration, our proposals evoked mostly chaos and confusion. Many Western politicians assumed a "defensive position" because they were obviously not prepared for such a course of events. The Soviet proposals seemed somewhat too drastic to them.

For example, Hans Dietrich Genscher, the FRG minister of foreign affairs. He declared that West Germany is also against nuclear arms, but that they should be reduced in several stages. As if we proposed to eliminate these weapons tomorrow.... The question is not to gradually or immediately ban nuclear weapons — the question is whether to reduce or increase the nuclear potential. This is the main point of our controversy between the USSR and the United States, between East and West. The goal of our foreign policy is to accelerate the process of negotiations on the question of disarmament, because the speed with which the negotiations are being conducted is fatally lagging behind the speed of the arms race. However, we are not capable of accomplishing this by ourselves. Gus Hall, the leader of the American Communists, recalled the old truth: "It takes two to tango." This also applies to the negotiations, which cannot be conducted unilaterally.

[Vasilkova] Can you say in which direction Soviet-American relations will further develop?

[Arbatov] We are well aware of the fact that it is not easy to obtain a positive answer from the United States, from the West as a whole. The approaches of the USSR and of the United States to international affairs differ considerably from one another. On

the one side we have the quest for mutually acceptable solutions, the effort to take into consideration the interests of the other side and to find a way out of the nuclear deadlock for humanity, a way out which avoids universal holocaust. To put it briefly, this is a flexible, unmistakable, and I would even say, masterful approach, based on the awareness of reality and understanding for all implications, as well as for all new elements introduced into the existing situation. The situation is such that, as one my American friends said, if a nuclear war should erupt, it will scarcely be possible to distinguish the ashes of capitalism from those of socialism. On the other hand, we are disappointed with the selection of partial truths made by the United States, "truths", such as the saying: "If you want peace you should be prepared for war", or "the winner is above law", or "strength is the most convincing argument," and so forth. When you listen to such miserable arguments, which history has long since rejected, you fell sorry for this great nation: What kind of short-sighted policy it is conducting?

Nevertheless, I do not think that we should make final pronouncements yet on the mood of the present U.S. Administration. It has frequently changed and I hope that this is possible even today. Recent public opinion polls in the United States suggest a drastic reduction in support for the military programs and expenditures of the White House. This is also confirmed by the numerous amendments to the military budget which were introduced by Congress and which seriously irritated the White House and the Pentagon. This is fully understandable, if we take into account the fact that military expenditures increasingly affect the vital interests of the people. The growing dissatisfaction with the general policy of the administration in the United States is an ever-intensifying process, in my opinion.

[Vasilkova] In your opinion, is there hope that a new Soviet-American summit meeting may take place?

[Arbatov] You see, there is a wise saying: "Politics is the art of the possible." We base our policy not upon illusions, but upon real possibilities. For a long time there was no possibility for us to conduct a dialogue with the United States. This dialogue is being actively conducted today. If both sides desire it, the meeting will not only take place, but will also produce concrete results. We must work for this opportunity. We think that a number of serious problems must be resolved at the meeting, problems connected with the main issues of USSR-U.S. relations. We have not given up hope in this respect.

The survival of mankind, and its prosperity and progress, as well are fully feasible goals. The necessary and obligatory pre-condition for transforming this goal into reality is to ensure relations of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. I would even say that there is no other alternative for mankind. The point is, we must either proceed along this path, or civilization will disappear from the face of the earth. We cannot, we have no right to choose the second alternative. Our common sense absolutely rejects this alternative.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1576

RELATED ISSUES

JAPAN REAFFIRMS NON-NUCLEAR POLICIES TO U.S.

OW160437 Tokyo KYODO in English 0406 GMT 16 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo, Aug. 16 KYODO -- Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari reconfirmed to United States Ambassador to Japan Mike Mansfield Saturday that Japan refuses to introduce nuclear weapons to its territory, a Foreign Ministry official said. Kuranari reconfirmed the Japanese policy to the U.S. envoy after the U.S. notified Japan Thursday that the battleship New Jersey, which is capable of launching nuclear cruise missiles, will visit Sasebo port, Nagasaki Prefecture, between August 24 and September 2. Shore leave will be granted to the crew and the ship will take on supplies, the official said.

Kuranari reportedly told Mansfield that Japanese Diet members have exressed fear that the U.S. is introducing nuclear weapons to Japan, particularly by the 45,000-ton New Jersey which is equipped with launching pads for Tomahawk cruise missiles. The Japanese government should dispel any such fears in the event of the New Jersey's port call, Kuranari told the envoy. Kuranari said the Japanese people have a "special feeling" regarding nuclear weapons and that Japan has maintained and will maintain "three nonnuclear principles" prohibiting the production, possession or introduction into Japanese territory of nuclear weapons, the official said. Kuranari was also quoted as saying that if the U.S. asks for prior consent on introducing nuclear weapons, Japan will deal with the matter in accordance with the three principles and that Japan will handle the matter under the Japan-U.S. security treaty and related agreements.

Mansfield told Kuranari that he understands the Japanese stance and the Japanese people's special feeling toward nuclear weapons, the official said. The U.S. envoy also said it is U.S. policy neither to affirm nor deny the existence of nuclear weapons, adding that the U.S. Government will respect the Japan-U.S. security treaty and related agreements, the official said.

/8309
CSO: 5260/129

RELATED ISSUES

JAPAN: PLANNED 'NEW JERSEY' VISIT SPARKS CONTROVERSY

OW191315 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Referring to the "USS New Jersey's" scheduled port call, Kenji Taguchi of the JSP, at a meeting of the House of Representatives Committee on cabinet affairs today, asked if the Tomahawk missiles carried by the ship were equipped with nuclear warheads.

[Begin recording] [Taguchi] Has it been confirmed that no nuclear warheads are aboard the "New Jersey?"

[Gotoda, chief cabinet secretary] Inasmuch as there has been no request from the U.S. Government for any prior consultations on bringing in nuclear arms, we believe, on the basis of the relationship of mutual trust under the Japan-U.S. security treaty, that the U.S. Government -- that is, the "New Jersey" in this case -- will not be bringing in any nuclear weapons. [end recording]

Meanwhile, Fujii, director of the Foreign Ministry's North American Affairs Bureau, answering Taguchi's question on the possibility of the "New Jersey" making Sasebo its home port, said that he had heard of misgivings about this spreading among local residents, but added that he had not the slightest knowledge about any U.S. plan to make Sasebo a home port for the "New Jersey."

/8309
CSO: 5260/130

RELATED ISSUES

JAPAN: 'NEW JERSEY' ARRIVES FOR PORT CALL AMID PROTESTS

Labor, Peace Activists Protest

OW240440 Tokyo KYODO in English 0436 GMT 24 Aug 86

[Text] Sasebo, Nagasaki Pref., Aug. 24 KYODO — U.S. battleship "New Jersey" sailed into the U.S. naval base here Sunday while thousands of demonstrators and a flotilla of small vessels protested the portcall for violating Japan's non-nuclear policy. The protestors, mostly labor unionists and peace activists, charged that the battleship is armed with nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles in violation of Japan's policy of banning the introduction of nuclear weapons into the country.

It was the first visit to Japan by the 45,000-ton "New Jersey" after it was refitted and recommissioned in 1982. Built in 1943, the battleship took part in the bombardment of Okinawa during World War II. Apart from its 16-inch guns, the refitted "New Jersey" is also equipped with eight Tomahawk launchers. The Tomahawks are cruise missiles which can carry both conventional and nuclear warheads.

The battleship, accompanied by an oil tanker, dropped anchors at the Akasaki quay at 10:30 a.m., and the 1,500-member crew was welcomed to Sasebo by local authorities and representatives from the Defense Agency. Security was tight at Sasebo, both at sea and on land.

As the huge warship made its way into the Sasebo Bay, an armada of 47 fishing boats and small vessels crisscrossed nearby in protest. Bedecked with red, green and white banners, the protest boats blared out anti-American slogans but the high-pitched shouts were barely audible amid deafening dins generated from ship engines and churning waves. The small vessels were kept from getting close to the towering "New Jersey" by 46 Maritime Safety patrol boats, which sailed alongside the warships.

On land, 3,600 riot police were mobilized to guard against possible guerrilla attacks by more than 500 leftwing radicals who had traveled to Sasebo, police said. Police said they arrested five demonstrators near the Sasebo railway station for squabbling with police during a protest march. The five were identified by police as members of a left-wing radical group called the "Senkiiryokawa-ha." The group, some 50 members strong, took out to the streets after a protest rally at a local park.

Some 600 labor unionists and peace activists staged rallies in the morning at Maebata Wharf, which overlooks the naval base across the Sasebo Bay. In the afternoon, another 14,000 protesters were to stage rallies and protest marches.

The "New Jersey" is part of a five-vessel flotilla which is on a nine-day visit to Japan for crew rest. Two other warships -- the 15,540-ton nuclear-powered cruiser "Long Beach" and the 2,750-ton missile frigate "Thach" -- docked at the U.S. naval base in Yokosuka, south of Tokyo, and the 5,770-ton destroyer "Merrill" berthed at Kure in Hiroshima Prefecture. Like the "New Jersey", these three smaller warships are also equipped wth Tomahawk misilles. They form the main elements of the Seventh Fleet's surface attack group. Defense sources say the five warships are scheduled to join other Seventh Fleet vessels for a major naval exercise in the Sea of Japan after the crew rest in Japan.

During a press conference aboard the "New Jersey," Rear Adm. R.A.K. Taylor, the surface attack group commander, refused to comment whether the warships were carrying nuclear-armed Tomahawks. The admiral said U.S. policy is neither to confirm nor deny the existence of nuclear weapons aboard U.S. warships. He said the five warships were put into three different ports for the sake of crew rest, repair and maintenance. Taylor also would not say where his ships were heading after their stay in Japan.

'Calm' Returns 25 August

OW250459 Tokyo KYODO in English 0448 GMT 25 Aug 86

[Text] Sasebo, Nagasaki Pref., Aug. 25 KYODO -- Calm returned to the port of Sasebo Monday after a day of rallies and demonstrations Sunday which greeted the arrival of the U.S. battleship "New Jersey." Protestors say the visit by the battleship, which is equipped with Tomahawk cruise missiles capable of being fitted with nuclear warheads, breaches the nonnuclear principles of Japan. Nagasaki prefectural police reduced their security force for the battleship's visit from 3,600 to 3,400 and are also considering reducing the security forces sent to assist them from other prefectures.

Capt. W.L. Glenn, captain of the 45,000-ton "New Jersey," and Rear Adm. R.A.K. Taylor, commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet's surface attack group, paid a courtesy call on Sasebo Mayor Kumashi Kakehashi Monday morning.

The police said most radical elements and other demonstrators from other countries had left Sasebo by Sunday evening but a 24-hour alert for possible actions against the warship during its nine-day stay. Six patrol boats are on guard around Sasebo Port's Akazaki Pier where the "New Jersey" is berthed.

A peace group affiliated with the Japan Socialist Party and the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (SOHYO) is holding an "antinuclear peace panel exhibition" at a park in downtown Sasebo. Three peace activists from Kyoto began a sit-in in front of the Sasebo municipal office Monday morning to protest at the port call by the "New Jersey." One of them, housewife Machiko Yoshida, 48, said she plans to continue the sit-in alone from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. from Tuesday through September 2 when the "New Jersey" is due to leave Sasebo Port.

/8309
CSO: 5260/132

- END -

JPRS-TAC-86-080

6 OCTOBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-080
6 OCTOBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR Space Research Institute Head on SDI, Moratorium
(Moscow TASS, 12 Sep 86)..... 1

Soviet Colonel: U.S. Rejects Compromise on SDI
(V. Chernyshov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 9 Sep 86).... 2

Soviet Chief of Staff on 'Proper Reply to SDI'
(Sergey Akhromeyev; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 35, 8 Sep 86).. 5

USSR: Challenger Tragedy Shows Dangers of SDI
(V. Golubkov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 26 Aug 86)..... 7

TASS Reports on Delta-Satellite SDI Test
(Moscow TASS, 5 Sep 86)..... 9

Pentagon Confirmation 9
Vehicle Launched 9

USSR: U.S. Radar Arrays Seen Violating ABM Treaty
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 10 Sep 86)..... 10

IZVESTIYA Examines European Defense Initiative
(Ye. Nikolayev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 15 Sep 86)..... 12

TASS: Publication of Anti-Star Wars Book Stopped in UK
(Taras Lariokhin; Moscow TASS, 15 Sep 86)..... 16

Prague TV: APN Military Commentator Outlines Anti-SDI Steps
(Prague Television Service, 22 Aug 86)..... 17

Briefs
Tests in New Mexico 18
U.S. Physicist Resigns 18

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS Report on Washington Round of Experts Talks
(Moscow TASS, 7 Sep 86)..... 19

USSR: Reports, Comments on Opening of Sixth Round
(Various sources, various dates)..... 20

Obukhov Arrival Statement 20
'Utter Confusion' in U.S. 21
White House Gags Aides, by A. Shalnev 22
Daniloff Case as Diversion, by Oleg Blinov 23
Sixth Round Opens 23
Obukhov on Reagan Cut Offer 23
Chernyshev Contrasts Stance, by Vladimir Chernyshev 24
Zholkver Sees No Progress, by Vladimir Fadeyev 25

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS Commentary on U.S. Refusal To Ratify SALT II
(Vladimir Bogahev; Moscow TASS, 17 Sep 86)..... 26

USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman Denies Missile Crash
(Paris AFP, 18 Sep 86)..... 28

Briefs
USSR Missile Tests 29

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR Lt Col: UK Courts 'Nuclear Enslavement' With Stealth Base
(Yu. Yurkin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 12 Sep 86)..... 30

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. Attempting To Undermine BW Convention
(N. Sinyavin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 9 Sep 86)..... 31

PRAVDA Hits Pentagon Aide's Remarks on Bacteriological Arms
(Vladimir Mikhaylov; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Aug 86)..... 33

USSR Reports, Commentary on Geneva BW Conference
(Various sources, various dates)..... 35

IZVESTIYA on Agenda, USSR Stance, by V. Kuznetsov 35
Conference Opens 36
Report on Israelyan Address, by Yevgeniy Korzhev 36

U.S. 'Fabrications' Condemned 37
U.S. Position on Ban, by Vladimir Tsvetov 38
Israelyan, Lowitz Addresses Conference 39
Alekseyev Commentary, by Sergey Alekseyev 40
U.S. Claims Regarded, by A. Golts 41
'Far-Fetched Accusations', by Yevgeniy Korzhev 42
Talks With UK Delegation 43

IZVESTIYA: Report on Use of Chemical Weapons by DRA Rebels
(D. Meshchaninov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 5 Sep 86)..... 44

IZVESTIYA Ridicules Angola CW Charge
(B. Pilyatskin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 7 Sep 86)..... 46

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRC People's Daily on Soviet Peace Efforts in CDE
(Gu Yaoming; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 13 Sep 86)..... 48

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S., World Response to Gorbachev RUDE PRAVO Replies
(Various sources, various dates)..... 50

Western Reports Faulted, by Aleksandr Zholkver 50
VREMYA Roundup, by Aleksandr Serikov, et al. 51
11 Sep Talk Show, by Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, et al. 52
U.S. 'Silence, Spy Mania', by Yevgeniy Grachev 58
PRAVDA Weekly Review, by Vladimir Peresada 59
14 Sep Talk Show, by Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, et al. 62
Broadcast to North America, by Vladimir Pozner, et al. 67
Gorbachev Answers Circulated at UN 70

USSR: Reports, Comments on U.S. 11 September Test
(Various sources, various dates)..... 71

TASS Report, by Igor Ignatyev 71
TASS Commentary, by Yuriy Kornilov 72
Monitoring Issue Dismissed, by Vladimir Tsvetov 73
'Absurd Logic', by Vladimir Bogachev 74

TASS: U.S. Delays Visas for N-Test Monitoring Meeting
(Moscow TASS, 16 Sep 86)..... 76

USSR's Vorontsov on Test Ban, Summit Chances
(Yuliy Vorontsov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 35, 8 Sep 86).... 77

IZVESTIYA's Bovin Gives Reassurance on Moratorium
(Aleksandr Bovin; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 35, 8 Sep 86).... 79

Soviet Army Paper Discusses Verification
(Ye. Nikitin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 31 Aug 86)..... 82

USSR: Swedish CD Envoy Says Monitoring 'Absolutely Reliable'
(V. Kuznetsov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 7 Sep 86)..... 87

USSR: Pyongyang Conference Urges Korean NFZ
(Various sources, various dates)..... 89

Kim Il-song Addresses Conference 89
Conference Supports Gorbachev Proposals 89
PRAVDA Commentary, by V. Razuvayev 90
Broadcast to China, by Shakov 91

Briefs
U.S.-Soviet Talks Recess 92

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU Official Zagladin on Control, Disarmament
(Rome International Service, 12 Sep 86)..... 93

BEIJING REVIEW on Superpower Arms Race
(Zhou Jirong, Huang Tingwei; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW,
No 37, 15 Sep 86)..... 94

PRC Commentaries on Disarmament 'Struggle'
(Hong Kong LIAOWANG OVERSEAS EDITION, No 36, 8 Sep 86;
Beijing to North America, 12 Sep 86)..... 98

International Disarmament Situation, by Li Ginzhen,
Li Ginggong 98
Commentary Advocates Conventional Disarmament, by
Chen Guang 100

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR SPACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE HEAD ON SDI, MORATORIUM

LD120847 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 12 TASS -- Mankind can now be destroyed by pushing a button. The Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests provides an opportunity to remove this danger, journalists were told by Director of the Institute of Space Explorations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Academician Roald Sagdeyev.

Many U.S. leaders, the academician said, explain their unwillingness to introduce moratorium on nuclear tests by saying that this will make impossible elaboration of the essential elements of the SDI -- actually, the star wars programme, though Washington stubbornly calls it "Strategic Defence Initiative".

One of the variants of technical solution of the Star Wars programme, said the scientist, is linked with the use of the laser beam to direct x-ray radiation. For this it is necessary to explode a nuclear medium-yield device. And therefore new warheads need to be developed and their tests held.

The academician said that the SDI programme was unrealistic. To create real defence from nuclear weapons means to rule out a possibility of penetration of even a few warheads into outer space. But this practically cannot be done, with 10,000-20,000 simultaneously flying warheads.

To put huge echelons of weapons into orbits and then systems to combat with them would signify one more twist in the arms spiral, the scientist said. We should learn to live in peace. There is no other way here but the way of detente in the military sphere. And this points once again to the exclusively great significance of the USSR's decision on extension of the moratorium on nuclear tests, stressed Roald Sagdeyev.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COLONEL: U.S. REJECTS COMPROMISE ON SDI

PM170934 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Technical Sciences Colonel V. Chernyshov under the rubric "A Reader Inquires": "The Earth in Alpha's Sights"; first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] "I believe that the U.S. Administration's negative reaction to the Soviet proposal to subscribe to the moratorium on nuclear explosions is largely accounted for by the U.S. ruling circles' desire to embark as soon as possible on the deployment of space weapons, some types of which they plan to equip with nuclear ammunition. I would like to know how far the United States has advanced in implementing the notorious 'star wars' program — V. Ivochkin, Perm."

"The present U.S. Administration is hardly able to drag itself along on matters of limiting and reducing arms," the American ABC-TV company states. The 5 and 1/2 years that the R. Reagan administration has been in power, Western commentators point out, have been a dead loss for the cause of nuclear arms control: The President has not utilized a single chance in this direction, although one and one-half of the two terms granted him in the White House are already behind him.

Whereas the United States has done nothing in matters of disarmament, in the arms race Washington is advancing with 7-league strides. Let us turn to the figures: In the last year of the J. Carter administration appropriations for the production of nuclear arms totaled 3.7 billion dollars, while for Fiscal 1987 they are planned in the sum of 8.2 billion dollars. "The weapons which we purchase today will serve as the basis of the U.S. military forces for many years after the start of the 21st century," U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger loudly declares. But the chief aim of Washington's military policy was revealed very eloquently by R. Bowman, president of the American Institute for Space and Security Studies: "We are tired of equality. The only way we can get back the lever of political pressure is to regain military superiority."

To achieve this aim the U.S. Administration plans to "reinforce" and supplement the American offensive nuclear potential with the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," known throughout the world as the "star wars" program. This program has become one of the chief obstacles at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

Guided by the desire to overcome the deadlock at the Geneva talks, the Soviet Union proposed to the United States reaching agreement on partial measures to prevent the militarization of space. It is a question, above all, of a commitment by the sides not to withdraw from the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems (the ABM Treaty) for 15 years, while strictly observing the limitations provided for in it.

However, the U.S. leadership refused to accept this compromise proposal. In this reply, so American newspapers report, the head of the White House expresses readiness to defer the deployment of arms in space under the "star wars" program for just 7 years. For 5 of these years the United States intends to develop [razrabotka] and test ABM components and space strike arms -- which in itself would be a violation of the ABM Treaty's provisions.

During the subsequent 2 years, according to the American plan, talks are to be held on the terms for deploying space systems. If such an agreement is not reached during the 2 years, each side will have the right to deploy a space-based ABM system after giving the other side 6 months' notice.

As the PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER remarked, the proposed "deferment" of SDI deployment for 5-7 years "means little."

In actual fact, by talking of continuing the development [razrabotka] and testing of nuclear space arms, the U.S. Administration is seeking to get the Soviet Union to "legitimize" the former's current emasculation of the ABM Treaty. And by proposing to reach agreement on the deployment of a "star wars" system after 5-7 years have elapsed, it is inviting the USSR to participate in destroying the entire foundation of the process of reducing and limiting strategic arms, one of whose cornerstones is the ABM treaty.

U.S. Administration spokesmen have tried to present this "blank shot" as some kind of "compromise" and a "far-reaching step" by Washington, with which they have even misled certain U.S. "hawks," who do not like even such a limited and meaningless "deferment" of the deployment of space strike arms. The President immediately clamed the "hawks" down. Addressing a group of SDI supporters -- representatives of right-wing conservative organizations -- he declared: "When the time comes and development [razrabotka] (of SDI) is complete, we intend to deploy it." That "revelation" provoked an ovation from the "star wars" apologists who filled the hall.

Why, then, does the obligation not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for 15 years, while strictly fulfilling the limitations provided for in it, 'not suit" the U.S. Administration, and why is the "deferment" of SDI deployment even by 5-7 years "not to the liking" of some people in the United States?

The present U.S. leadership has decided to work toward implementing the "star wars" program, and to bring it to the point of deployment as soon as possible. P. Buchanan, White House director of communications, for example, frankly states that the purpose of any talks is to "secure the future of SDI."

As for the possible time for starting the deployment of arms under the "star wars" program, it is not as far off as Washington sometimes tries to make out. This is evidenced by the present administration's practical work and its concrete plans. Here they are:

First: The United States has already put the "star wars" machinery into shape. Thus, a "star military-industrial complex," embracing more than 1,500 industrial firms and research organizations which have received orders from the Pentagon to create [sozdaniye] components of space strike arms, has essentially been set up within the military-industrial complex. A joint space command of the U.S. Armed Forces, Air Force and Navy space commands, and an Army space operations office have been knocked

together. They are ready at any moment to put space strike arms into "combat operation." Moreover, among the Pentagon's top leadership there is increasingly frequent talk of the need to form in the very near future an independent new branch of the U.S. Armed Forces -- a military space force which would operate on an equal footing with the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Second: Arms are being developed [razrabatyvat] for the "star wars" system at an accelerated pace. Several models of chemical lasers (the Miracle, Alpha, (Rashel), and Sigma Tau experimental weapons systems), free-electron lasers, and excimer lasers have already been created. [sozdat].

Underground tests of x-ray lasers pumped by a nuclear explosion are being conducted. Devices which ensure the development [otrabotka] of beam weapons are operating in the nuclear laboratory at Los Alamos and the (Sandia) National Laboratory. A modern accelerator -- a "prototype" of a beam weapon -- is being built at the Lawrence Livermore Radiation Laboratory. American firms and laboratories have built no less than eight different models of electromagnetic guns earmarked for SDI.

Third: The Pentagon has drawn up a general, "integrated" plan for a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements.

Fourth: It is planned to deploy a seven-echelon "star wars" system stage by stage, as particular types of arms become ready, without waiting, in particular, for work to be completed on creating [sozdaniye] "exotic types of weapons. According to a statement by General J. Abrahamson, director of the SDI program, by the early nineties the United States will already to able to deploy "first-generation space weapons," including combat orbital stations with small homing missiles.

Fifth, The Pentagon does not rule out the possibility of deploying at the first stage ground missile complexes to intercept warheads in the final sector of their trajectory. Such means already exist. They have only to be brought up to modern technical standards.

In August of this year representatives of U.S. right-wing organizations held a press conference in Congress "in defense of SDI." They advocated making an immediate start on deploying the "star wars" system. "If we can obtain a system that is efficient and that make the Soviet Union's arms inefficient," Pentagon chief C. Weinberger expressed the "dreams" of the military-industrial complex, "then we will return to the situation when we were the only country to possess nuclear weapons."

Of course, such calculations are hopeless. Our country will not allow itself to be overtaken in the military strategic sphere and will take appropriate countermeasures. "If necessary, we will quickly find a reply, and it will not be what the United States expects," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his statement. "But it will be an answer which will make the 'star war' program worthless."

However, implementation of the SDI plans would lead to an absolutely uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, universal uncertainty, and an increased risk of nuclear catastrophe. This is why the Soviet Union calls again and again on the U.S. Administration to heed the arguments of reason.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF ON 'PROPER REPLY TO SDI'

PM110807 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 4-5

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy minister of defense and chief of General Staff, under the general headline "The Historic Chance Must Not Be Missed": "A Military Man's View. We will Find the Proper Reply to SDI"]

[Text] Whitewashing the U.S. Administration's refusal to terminate nuclear explosions, some American representatives contend that since the U.S. is behind the U.S.S.R. in the modernisation of nuclear weaponry it needs to stage tests. Washington also says that the U.S.S.R. can afford the moratorium because it is supposedly ahead of the U.S. in the number of tests conducted. These statements are inaccurate. The facts show that it is the U.S. that is in the lead in the number of nuclear tests held, accounting for more than half of all explosions detonated over the entire period worldwide. The U.S. is also in the lead in the number of tests in each medium, in the atmosphere, under ground and under water.

Consider the last two years. In 1984 the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. conducted an approximately equal number of nuclear tests. In 1985 the U.S.S.R. conducted nine tests, prior to its moratorium, while the U.S. staged 20. The U.S.S.R. has staged no nuclear tests for more than a year now, while the U.S. has conducted 18 since our moratorium came into effect. Of this number it reported 15. The other three, which it did not report, were of low capacity. One was held in August 1985, just after the Soviet-announced moratorium, the other two were conducted in the autumn of 1985 and in the spring of 1986. They were recorded by the national technical means available to the Soviet Union.

Hence, the issue is not one of a "lag", but rather that if nuclear testing is stopped, it will be impossible to develop national anti-missile defences or deploy space-based strike weaponry, at any rate on the large scale envisaged in the U.S. Furthermore, the Pentagon intends to modernize its nuclear potential completely. To this end new nuclear warheads are needed, and these must be tested. Some nuclear tests are conducted to ascertain the reliability of existing nuclear devices. However, they account for a very small proportion of tests.

Eighty percent of tests, perhaps even more, are carried out to develop new nuclear weaponry and energy sources for space-based arms.

When U.S. preparations for "star wars" are mentioned, what is meant are plans to employ a multi-tiered system for the anti-missile defence of U.S. territory and to devise and deploy space-based strike weapons. The aim of the U.S. is to make Soviet strategic nuclear forces worthless, disarm the U.S.S.R. and thus acquire the opportunity to

threaten us continually with a massive nuclear-missile strike. The deployment of national ABM defences and space-based strike weaponry will upset the existing military equilibrium between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. generate strategic chaos instead of stability, and drastically increase the danger of nuclear war.

Should the U.S. continue to implement its plans for "star wars" the U.S.S.R. will be obliged to take appropriate measures in response. We will quickly find a suitable reply and, moreover, it will not be what the U.S. expects. It will be a reply that will make the "star wars" programme worthless. The U.S. has no monopoly on scientific and technological progress in the military field. [paragraph continues]

The development of science and technology in this field has reached a level at which the perennial struggle between sword and shield, defensive and offensive weaponry, is decided in many, not just one, directions. The U.S.S.R. is capable of meeting U.S. action to subvert the balance by means of a national anti-missile defence system and space-based strike weaponry. However, strategic offensive weaponry may be improved in a manner that will make the SDI programme fabulously expensive and difficult to implement. There are other possibilities as well.

Of course, if the U.S. deploys SDI we will have to reply. Unfortunately, we shall require additional resources to do so. But why waste resources and manpower devising newer and newer kinds of weaponry? That is another reason, prompted by economic considerations, why we want to end the arms race and are opposed to the development of space-based strike systems.

However, in the present situation the U.S.S.R. is obliged to conduct research in many fields. In some of these we can confidently envisage effective measures to counteract the U.S. SDI programme. They could be promptly implemented should the U.S. deploy a national ABM system and space-based strike weaponry. The U.S.S.R. will choose modes of operation that best accord with its defence interests and will in turn confront the U.S. with the need to find a reply.

But if nuclear testing is stopped, the further development of strategic armaments will also be halted. It will then be well-nigh impossible to deploy either space-based strike weaponry or national anti-missile defences. The U.S.S.R. has a stake in this. In announcing the extension of its moratorium, it hopes that peace-loving states and the world community will support it. The decision to extend the moratorium for the fourth time had to be weighed carefully. It was vital to have an accurate estimation of the balance of forces. Still, we placed ourselves at a definite disadvantage, believing it to be acceptable for the time being. Our own defence capacity and that of our friends is being maintained at proper levels.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: CHALLENGER TRAGEDY SHOWS DANGERS OF SDI

PM291400 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Aug 86 p 3

["International Commentary" by Candidate of Juridical Sciences V. Golubkov: "The Challenger Tragedy and 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] There has been plenty of analysis of the Challenger tragedy in the Western press. The potential of USAF launch vehicles capable of temporarily replacing the shuttle and the new space-plane technology of the next century are being discussed. Quite a few conclusions have been drawn about the booster rocket casing, poor seals, low fuel quality, and also the destructive capacity of maximum dynamic pressure during boost phase...

But only a few people in the West are considering the fact that mankind will quite soon find itself at a point where it is confronted by a risk on an inconceivable scale. And those fears are unquestionably well-founded, particularly with regard to the current development [razrabotka] of strike weapons under the "star wars" program.

Specialists are now asking whether the United States is not overestimating the potential of its space and electronics equipment, even if it is the most advanced. Can the deciding of questions involving people's fate be entrusted to electronics and equipment? They recall a case--a case thought to be inconceivable from the theoretical standpoint--when five computers backing each other up failed one after the other. Experts maintain the NASA "inadequately studied the technical aspects of the program of shuttle flights," "hurried to turn them into proper commercial flights," set very tight work schedules, and dismissed as insignificant the faults which periodically arose on craft in the series, although no one studied them in depth, just as no one studied their possible consequences, in which connection one Challenger pilot warned about the "possibility of such a tragedy."

But there is another highly symptomatic feature too. Literally hours after millions of television viewers had seen Challenger--that "symbol of U.S. space achievements"--turn into a fireball, some legislators close to the American Administration began assuring people that the catastrophe would not affect the work on the other U.S. space program--the "star wars" program. That observation was no accident, because there is much in common between these two directions in the Pentagon's development [razrabotka] of space strike systems.

First, what we have is the same political and psychological approach--blind faith in the omnipotence of American space equipment. It is clear that with the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapon systems important decisions with irreversible consequences will be made by machines rather than people. And yet it was precisely the hardware which failed on Challenger!

Second, the U.S. Administration has demonstrated the same haste regarding the "star wars" program, the same desire to conceal failures and inflate successes, and the same disregard for warnings and criticism from politicians and specialists that the whole program might end in a global tragedy.

Moscow has constantly warned the American Administration about this. America's stubborn desire to create a "universal" space arms system is at best a highly dangerous illusion. However, across the Atlantic they ask with attempted humor: "So why is the USSR worried about SDI if it is an illusion?"

The USSR is worried not because it fears it will be left behind in the space race; if it is forced upon us we will quickly find an answer, and, as was pointed out by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his 18 August statement on Soviet television, the answer "will not be what the United States expects."

The USSR is well aware that it is very easy to turn any "space shield" into a "space sword" and that those who are creating [sozdat] it are deliberately seeking to destroy the military-strategic parity between the powers, leaving aside the possible temptation to use the weapon. Mankind would come dangerously close to a global catastrophe compared with which the Challenger tragedy is a grain of sand as against a sandstorm. And whereas after the Challenger accident it was possible to stop further flights by spacecraft of that series in order to establish the causes, after a global catastrophe human civilization could no longer be restored...

When he made his statement on Soviet television on 18 August M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave the American Administration yet another chance to show that it is really, as opposed to merely verbally, committed to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons on earth. It is quite clear that instead of creating [sozdat] space strike weapons in the next 10-15 years for the alleged purpose of eliminating nuclear armaments, it is far more sensible to set about destroying those very armaments during those years and reducing them to zero. Such a specific and realistic program has been proposed by the Soviet Union.

Thinking again about whether to plunge the world into a very dangerous space arms race through SDI or embark on sincere efforts to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons and stop all nuclear weapons tests on the basis of the Soviet Union's proposals--that is what appears to us in Moscow to be the lesson of the Challenger tragedy for both the United States and the whole world.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS ON DELTA-SATELLITE SDI TEST

Pentagon Confirmation

LD050647 Moscow TASS in English 0609 GMT 5 Sep 86

["Preparations for Test Under SDI"—TASS heading]

[Text] Washington, 5 Sep (TASS)--A Pentagon spokesman has confirmed the fact that a new test under the Strategic Defense Initiative is now in preparation but refused to comment the details.

AP News Agency has reported, however, that a booster rocket, "Delta", designed to dislodge two payloads into orbit would be launched in the next few days. One of the objectives will be used as a target and the second will perform the role of the killer-statellite.

The principal goal of the experiment is to test guidance and navigation systems and the possibility of tracking the payload with a laser beam with a view to destroying it.

Vehicle Launched

LD052020 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 5 Sep 86

[Text] Washington, 5 Sep (TASS)—A "Delta" delivery vehicle has been launched from the Cosmodrome on Cape Canaveral today. On board the delivery vehicle is equipment for carrying out an experiment under the "star wars" program.

The "Delta" is to put into an orbit a fighter satellite and a target to be destroyed in outer space. According to the UPI agency, a system of orientation and guidance of the satellite against a target is to be tested in the course of the experiment.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. RADAR ARRAYS SEEN VIOLATING ABM TREATY

PM111407 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Sep 66 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel I. Gorev under the rubric "Exposed by the Facts": "A Blatant Challenge. The United States Is Violating the ABM Treaty"]

[Text] The U.S. attitude to the observance of international agreements has recently come under close scrutiny by the progressive public. This is no accident. The U.S. Adminstration's recent decision to stop observing Soviet-American agreements in the strategic offensive arms limitation sphere — the SALT I Interim Agreement and the SALT II Treaty — was a clear challenge to the cause of peace. The all-embracing program for rearming America, adopted by Washington in 1981, does not fit the framework of these very important documents. Of the two possibilities — observance of agreements or the arms race — the latter was chosen.

One cannot help noticing that something similar is threatening the ABM Treaty as well. It is obviously getting in the way of the implementation of the program for creating extensive ABM defenses, announced by the U.S. Administration in 1983, and proving an obstacle to the implementation of the Pentagon's plans for attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. U.S. military circles make no bones about this. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger plainly stated: "We must consider the possibility of actually breaking with the ABM Treaty."

It must be stressed that people in the United States are not confining themselves to statements but are actually contravening the ABM Treaty. This is evidenced by the deployment of the big Pave Paws phased array radar station in Greenland (Thule) and preparations for the construction of one in Britian (Fylingdales). Under the ABM Treaty the sides pledged not to deploy missile attack warning radar stations, except on the periphery of their national territory and oriented outward. Major phased array radar stations must not be deployed outside permitted ABM areas (the Grand Forks ICBM base, which is on U.S. territory, in the state of North Dakota, is one such area), outside ABM test sites (the United States has set up sites on Kwajalein Atoll and at White Sands, New Mexico), except for the purpose of tracking objects in outer space or for use as national technical means of verification (kontrol).

Official Pentagon spokesmen have made it plain that the radar stations in Greenland and Britain are missile attack warning stations. So the question arises: Since when have Greenland, which belongs to Denmark, and Britain been U.S. territory or its periphery?

The work being done to construct the new radar stations at the ballistic missile early warning station missile attack warning posts (Thule and Fylingdales) is portrayed by the United States as modernization of the existing radar stations. [paragraph continues]

These claims are obviously false. Even Pentagon spokesmen refer to these radar stations as new ones. For example, G. Keyworth, former under secretary of defense for research and engineering, made it clear to Congress that "the conventional radar stations constructed 20 years ago in Thule are being replaced with a new phased array radar station."

It is perfectly obvious that the construction of a fundamentally different, phased array radar station has been going on since 1984 at the post in Thule, Greenland, to replace the existing four old conventional antenna radar stations. This station is similar to the Pave Paws radar stations which have been deployed or are being constructed on U.S. territory. The potential of the new station in Thule will far exceed the potential of large radar stations as stipulated by the countries [as published] in the ABM Treaty. The new radar station should provide a larger scanning area, increased range, and the capability to track a large number of targets simultaneously.

Confirmation of the fact that new facilities are being constructed at the Thule post in Greenland is provided by this photograph published in a U.S. magazine [the article is accompanied by a small photograph apparently showing a Pave Paws radar installation]. The antenna of the old radar station can be seen behind the antenna system building which is under construction and which is a closed structure around 80 meters high with two planar phased arrays. The Soviet side has repeatedly warned the United States of the illegality of its actions in connection with the construction of the new radar station in Greenland and has proposed a constructive solution to the question, but the United States has not responded positively to the USSR's proposal.

The new U.S. radar station in Britain will also be an obvious violation of the ABM Treaty. Unlike the other Pave Paws stations, this one will have three phased arrays, ensuring all-round observation, as well as a bigger capacity. In this case there can be no question of modernization because the plan is to builld a fundamentally new facility: A station of a fundamentally new design will be constructed to replace the radar station which does not have a phased array. This is confirmed by authoritative Western experts who participated in the preparation of the ABM Treaty.

The Soviet Union has warned both the U.S. and British Governments about actions incompatible with the treaty. Nevertheless, in May London officially announced the decision to permit the United States to deploy a new Pave Paws radar station at the Fylingdales post.

These are just a few examples of the scornful U.S. attitude to observance of the ABM Treaty. Yet it is the foundation stone, curbing the strategic arms race, on which future accords in the offensive arms limitation sphere can be built. Washington's line of undermining existing agreements and destroying a system of mutual commitments elaborated through joint efforts is further evidence of the adventurist U.S. course of trying to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union and contradicts the peoples' peace-loving aspirations.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA EXAMINES EUROPEAN DEFENSE INITIATIVE

PM151535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Ye. Nikolayev article: "Clear Skies for Europe"]

[Text] Like Don Quixote tilting at windmills military-political circles in certain West European countries are now thinking up enemies for themselves -- only unlike the hero of Cervantes' novel, not in order to do good but to justify evil: more and more extremely dangerous and destabilizing spirals in the arms race. Referring to some kind of "missile threat" to West Europe, certain figures in the NATO countries, particularly the FRG, are trying to impose on Europeans the idea that it is necessary not only to participate in the U.S. SDI program but to develop [razvitiye] in addition to this their own "European Defense Initiative" (EDI).

To substantiate this initiative the thesis put forward is that if the United States goes further down the road of implementing its "star wars" program the USSR will obviously also create [sozdast] a similar "space shield" for itself in the future. As a result, the NATO strategists point out, Western Europe would be left "exposed" and would turn into a zone of "reduced security." Who knows, they say, whether the United States, hiding from the "Soviet missile threat," will want to defend Western Europe from it, too, despite allegedly promising to do so now.

Seeing that these arguments produced a skeptical reaction from most sober-minded people in the West, the apologists and theoreticians of EDI are also using the following arguments: Even if the U.S. SDI does not produce the results expected by the White House and it does not prove possible to erect a 100-percent "shield" over the United States, the European NATO countries should nonetheless have effective means for combating Soviet missiles, and not only nuclear missiles but those "equipped with chemical and even conventional warheads."

Active calculations are being made about how -- before the creation [sozdaniye] of new SDI means -- to use the air defense systems available to NATO, specifically the U.S. Patriot antiaircraft missile complexes, for these purposes. It is believed that after certain additions it would be possible to enable these complexes to carry out ABM tasks, that is, to combat ballistic missiles. But the main thing, so the NATO generals say, is to create [sozdaniye] ABM systems and components (including space-based systems and components) specially adapted to European conditions, and to create [sozdat] and utilize to that end the latest technology -- laser and particle beam weapons, electromagnetic guns, and other exotic means of warfare.

Judging by existing reports, the process of implementing EDI is conceived both in the form of independent efforts on the part of West European countries in this sphere and in the form of a two-way street: The West Europeans could participate in implementing the U.S. SDI and SDI would pay scientific and technical dividends for EDI.

The U.S. Administration itself, having set itself the goal of firmly hitching its Western partners to its "star chariot," has recently been listening with increasing persistence to the European idea that before large-scale ABM systems are created [sozdany] their technology could be successfully used within the framework of the U.S. SDI for combating missiles of less than strategic range in the European theater.

U.S. right-wing conservative organizations such as the "Heritage Foundation" publish report after report showing that for the United States it would best to begin deploying space arms from Europe. First, they say, Europe is the frontline for Washington's nuclear strategy, and second, the authors of these reports and recommendations claim that Europe could be used to bypass the bans envisaged by the ABM Treaty on the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system for U.S. territory and on the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment space strike arms.

The fact that the U.S. military-industrial complex is interested both in SDI and EDI is clear. But what do the West Europeans themselves think on this score? If it is a question of defending Europe and ensuring a peaceful and nonuclear future for the continent, why enclose this entire palisade of arms in the form of SDI for Europe, an independent EDI, or combinations of both? Why, one wonders, use a sledgehammer to crack a nut and create [sozdavat] on a continent already crammed with arms more and more types of weapons, when one need only go along with the relevant Soviet proposals and adopt the Soviet program for eliminating nuclear and other types of mass destruction weaponry by the year 2000, so as once and for all and without damaging anyone's security to ensure lasting peace for Europe -- a peace without nuclear and chemical weapons and without space arms. And even conventional arms and armed forces could be greatly reduced, were the West to initiate the necessary work in this direction in accordance with the Warsaw Pact countries' recently submitted proposals on this score. What strange and dangerous logic -- building up arms in the hope of ultimately getting rid of them!

The Soviet Union proposes another way -- a way of reaching agreements which would ensure the prevention of an arms race in space and the ending of it on earth. The Soviet side is prepared to take major steps in this direction, including partial solutions. It has put corresponding proposals on the negotiating table with the United States, which would lead to concrete results, were matters to go forward.

On 18 August this year the statement on Soviet television by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, announced the Soviet side's decision to extend the more than year-long unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987.

The ending of nuclear tests by the two major nuclear powers -- the USSR and the United States -- would by itself be an important step along the path toward eliminating nuclear weapons. Without tests it would be impossible to improve and create [sozdavat] new types of nuclear weapons, including combat nuclear-pumped lasers within the SDI program.

Given a ban on space strike arms the Soviet side would be prepared to embark on a radical, 50-percent, reduction in Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory; at the same time it advocates reducing the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe by eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone as a frist step toward completely ridding the European continent of nuclear weapons.

As for Soviet operational-tactical missiles, as has already been publicly stated by the Soviet side, in the event of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe being entirely eliminated, Soviet enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles would be withdrawn from GDR and Czechoslovak territory.

As soon as agreement is reached on medium-range missiles in Europe the Soviet side would be prepared to immediately embark on working out accords on missiles of less than 1,000-km range with regard to this zone. On the whole it is proposed to radically resolve the question of tactical nuclear weapons in the second phase of the implementation of the Soviet program aimed at ridding the planet of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Good prospects for an accelerated solution to this problem are opened up by the Warsaw Pact states' initiative on armed forces and conventional arms reductions in Europe: Along with the European states' reduced ground forces and tactical aircraft as well as reductions to the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces and means deployed in Europe, their organic arms, including nuclear weapons, would also be reduced.

In this context we should recall what was stated by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during his meeting with British parliamentarians. If, he said, a NATO country such as Britain, for instance, decided to eliminate its nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would be prepared to respond by making an equivalent reduction in its nuclear potential. And if foreign nuclear weapons were removed from British territory the Soviet Union would guarantee that its nuclear means would not be targeted against British territory and would never be used against Britain.

Unfortunately, dodging these vitally importance Soviet initiatives which make sense to everyone, NATO militarist circles have been continuing with considerable fervor to support the European version of "star wars." This is an extremely dangerous and destablilizing course for the entire strategic situation. Both the spread of SDI action to Europe and the implementation of an independent EDI are an essentially new component in Washington's global strategy aimed at obtaining military superiority over the USSR and represent attempts to involve the West European countries increasingly extensively in U.S. military and space preparations.

A West European ABM system, were one to be created [sozdana], would be used in conjunction with existing U.S. and NATO offensive nuclear arms in Europe. It therefore cannot be seen as anything but a direct supplement to the nuclear arsenals existing on the continent and a kind of "antimissile umbrella" intended, in particular, to protect the Pershing 2 and ground-launched cruise missiles which the United States is continuing to site in West Europe. And the EDI means themselves, West European military figures and experts point out, could be used for striking against targets directly on the other side's territory.

It is also obvious that a "European Defense Initiative" fully accords with the new aggressive concept recently espoused by NATO of inflicting massive strikes deep inside the territories of the Warsaw Pact countries. Termed the "Rogers Plan" -- after the U.S. general who is supreme allied commander NATO forces, Europe -- this concept is a version specially adapted for West Europe of the "Airland Battle" doctrine adopted by the U.S. Army in its new regulations. It emphasizes massive preventive deep strikes against the enemy's defenses with both the latest nonuclear arms -- approximate to nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive potential -- and nuclear chemical arms. The systems that it is proposed to create [sozdat] within the EDI framework would be wholly included in this aggressive plan.

The negative consequences of implementing EDI would not be long in materializing. The Soviet side would be unable to remain neutral were the NATO countries to create [sozdaniye] and be equipped with these new arms. Countermeasures would be taken to restore equilibrium. [paragraph continues]

The implementation of EDI would seriously undermine the efforts to reduce the level of military confrontation on the continent and would create additional difficulties at all forums where talks are conducted on arms limitation and reduction, including the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

By embarking on the path of implementing EDI, the West European countries would give impetus to a new, dangerous, and costly spiral in the arms race, which would sharply destabilize the situation both in Europe and beyond. European security and international security as a whole would be undermined rather than strengthened.

In short, this is not the course which should be followed. There is another hopeful prospect being opened up for lasting security and peace in Europe by the Soviet initiatives. This is also promoted by the restraint shown by the Soviet Union on military matters, examples of which are the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the ending of deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone since last April, the removal of SS-20 missiles from combat duty in April of the same year, and the fact that the Soviet side has not tested any antisatellite weapons. The Soviet side's constructive approach is thus obvious. It is a reality and West Europe need only make use of it.

Everyone can see that the Europeans are tired of nerve-racking confrontation and tension. It is necessary to entirely rid political thinking of the concept of Europe as a "military theater." It must really become an example of the coexistence of sovereign, different, but peace-loving states that recognize their interpependence and base their relations on trust. The way toward this lies through ridding Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals -- of the explosive burden of arms.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: PUBLICATION OF ANTI-STAR WARS BOOK STOPPED IN UK

LD152247 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 15 Sep 86

[Text] London, 15 Sep (TASS)--TASS correspondent Taras Lariokhin reports:

Certain circles in Britain obviously did not like the book by Richard Annals dealing with the dangerous character of the U.S. "star wars" program which was being prepared for publication. Without any explanations the John Whiley and Sons Limited Publishing House which already brought out the advance copies of the book, stopped its further publication.

This sudden decision was obviously taken under the pressure of certain quarters, Annals pointed out in a letter to the publishers. The publishing house has published several thousand copies of the book already, which are now locked [up]. Moreover, the title of the book was ruled out of all the catalogues. The letter emphasized that in a truly free society books were published to be read and not to be burned or turned into waste paper.

The book which is of publicistic nature reflects not only the critical attitude of the author to the U.S. plans of the militarization of space, but also the views on this problem of Neil Kinnock, leader of the Labor Party, Shirley Williams, chairman of the Social Democratic Party, and David Steel, leader of the Liberal Party. Last July copies of the book were sent out to British mass media organs, representatives of the Conservative Government of Britain and the U.S. Department of State.

Annals said that when writing the book, he did not think about profits. He only wanted to bring home to people what he regards as the most important aspects of the problem. According to Annals, the book is not of a slanderous nature, and its publication does not violate either the British or American laws. He came to the conclusion that the publishers had been intimidated.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAGUE TV: APN MILITARY COMMENTATOR OUTLINES ANTI-SDI STEPS

LD221827 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 1730 GMT 22 Aug 86

[No video available]

[Summary] The world's press has commented on the extended Soviet nuclear test moratorium. Today's PRAVDA also carries an article on this topic. "As Comrade Gorbachev said on Monday, the Soviet Union will quickly find an answer which will devalue the star wars program."

Our Moscow correspondent Jiri Vitous asked Vasiliy Morozov, the military and political commentator of APN agency about what is behind this formulation from the military point of view.

[Begin Morozov recording in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] "The answer to the question of what measures could devalue the U.S. star wars program can be divided into two basic categories. The first is a possibility which is technically fully realistic to make the operation of this very complicated system impossible by means of space mines [kosmickych min] and other means. It is not such a problem to put space control elements [ridici kosmicke clanky], communication elements, and energy sources out of operation. And the second category of retaliatory measures is the development and perfecting of such means which would, to put it simply, break through this space shield. This would then mean increasing the potential of missiles on Soviet territory, increasing their striking force and accuracy. Where will all this lead? It will lead to the fact that the efforts of the United States to achieve its long-awaited nuclear supremacy over the Soviet Union will be broken and the star wars program will become simply an illusion which will nevertheless cost American tax payers an enormous amount of money but will still not bring the expected effect." [end recording]

/9738
CSO: 5200/1584

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TESTS IN NEW MEXICO--Washington, 12 Sep (TASS)--The United States has conducted another test of its anti-missile system. According to a Pentagon spokesman, a modernized Patriot anti-aircraft missile was launched from the White Sands, New Mexico, Missile Range on Thursday. For the first time, the missile, designed to destroy enemy planes, intercepted and destroyed a Lance missile in flight. The ASSOCIATED PRESS [AP] observed that the test was carried out within the framework of the program of developing weapons to be used tactical missiles, initiated by the Pentagon in 1984. An amount of U.S.$56 million was allocated to the Defense Department for these purposes this year alone. The AP noted that the new anti-missile system was intended for deployment on the territory of the Western European NATO countries. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0610 GMT 12 Sep 86 LD] /9738

U.S. PHYSICIST RESIGNS--San Francisco, 11 Sep (TASS)--Physicist Peter Hagelstein, one of the top U.S. physicists working on President Reagan's "star wars" program, has quit it on political grounds. Peter Hagelstein was co-author of the theory of x-ray lasers based on nuclear explosion energy and headed a relevant project at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California. As was admitted by senior officials of the laboratory, discoveries of Hagelstein who turned 32 not so long ago, were of the key significance for the whole star wars program. Motivating his decision, the physicist said he wanted to do work that would "benefit all mankind". [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 11 Sep 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1584

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

TASS REPORT ON WASHINGTON ROUND OF EXPERTS TALKS

LD070519 Moscow TASS in English 0511 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Washington September 7 TASS -- The second round of Soviet-U.S. expert consultations on nuclear and space arms took place here on September 5 and 6.

They were held in preparation for the forthcoming visit between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

The group of Soviet experts at the consultations was led by Ambassador Viktor Karpov, while the U.S. expert group was led by Ambassador Paul Nitze.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1583

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON OPENING OF SIXTH ROUND

Obukhov Arrival Statement

LD161639 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 16 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva September 16 TASS -- The Soviet delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons arrived here today to conduct the 6th round of the talks.

The acting head of the delegation, Ambassador at large A.A. Obukhov, said in a statement made at the airport upon arrival that the Soviet Union's line at the talks was clear and precise. It is based on the foreign policy goals formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress and on the Program, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on January 15, for the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the current century provided an arms race in outer space is effectively prevented.

Seeking to lessen and eventually eliminate the threat of nuclear war and to strengthen strategic stability, the Soviet side presented at the talks a series of far-reaching proposals.

As a counterbalance to the "star wars" plans, we call for a total ban on space strike weapons, for the development of peaceful cooperation in space, for "star peace." If the problems of space are resolved in this manner, it will become possible and quite realistic to make deep cuts, up to 50 per cent, in the Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons reaching each other's territories.

The Soviet Union's proposal on the elimination of American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe is promoting the goal of the drastic lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation and the normalization of the situation in Europe and elsewhere, the Soviet delegate said. This question can be resolved if the USA shows realism and goodwill. The Soviet side, we repeat, stands for bold and drastic measures to put an end to military rivalry. But we, naturally, are far from taking an "all or nothing" stand. The Soviet delegation arrived at the talks with the instruction to continue a search for ways to overcome deadlocks and to find quick and mutually acceptable solutions to questions standing in the way of progress. We are not seeking military advantage. However, reciprocity and complementary efforts from the American delegation are needed here.

To achieve accord the Soviet Union, taking account of the position of the United States, tabled compromise proposals at the previous round of the talks. An important role, in particular, from the point of view of providing favourable conditions for the drafting of accords at the talks on nuclear and space weapons, would be played by the ending of nuclear tests on a reciprocal basis. The USSR has not conducted nuclear explosions since August last year. Recently our unilateral moratorium was extended to January 1, 1987. This fact is self-evident. The Soviet side suggests that the termination of nuclear tests be the subject of a real accord with the USA, which could give an impetus to the solution of other questions.

In short, we are resolutely for breaking the deadlock at the talks at long last and for achieving practical progress at them on the basis of mutual understanding, recorded in the joint Soviet-American statement of November 21, 1985, and strictly in accord with the requirement of equal security. We would like to hope that the American side will give at the new round of the talks a businesslike and constructive answer to the Soviet initiatives. In conclusion the head of the Soviet delegation thanked the citizens and authorities of the Geneva canton for their hospitalitdy and cordiality.

'Utter Confusion' in U.S.

LD170005 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 16 Aug 86

[Text] In the past few days there has been much talk in the American mass media about the letter sent by President Reagan to the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow. Here is what Valentin Zorin writes:

The letter is a response to Mikhail Gorbachev's new important proposals on disarmament and Soviet-American relations. Without waiting for Moscow's reaction to the letter from the White House the American news media have launched a wide campaign which gives the impression of being organized and inspired in advance. The campaign mainly aims at making the world and the American public believe that Washington has studied the Soviet initiatives constructively and in a detailed way and it is now Moscow's turn to respond. As President Reagan put it, the ball is now in their court.

However, President Reagan's well-publicized message falls short of a substantive response to the constructive proposals addressed by the Kremlin to the White House at the end of June. The information made public in the United States shows that there has been no major change in the American stand. So far Washington has not answered the Soviet proposals constructively. There is utter confusion in Washington on important issues. High ranking administrative officials have been making statements that rule out each other. They first say that the Strategic Defense Initiative could be discussed at Soviet-American talks and then make clarifications and amendments indicating that there can be no talks on the Strategic Defense Initiative. One can only wonder what Washington officials really think and why they quite often contradict each other on one and the same issue. Let us put the question this way: What's new in the American stand on disarmament, on ways to stop nuclear testing and prevent an arms race in outer space? Judging by reports published in the United States the latest Washington documents contained nothing that would give the opportunity and grounds to claim that Washington has done its part and it is now for Moscow to act.

It looks like an attempt is in the making to substitute a noisy campaign in the press and a desire to score points in a propaganda drive for real steps to meet the Soviet Union half way.

White House Gags Aides

PM151525 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Shalnev "Rejoinder": "So As To Avoid 'Unnecessary' Questions"]

[Text] Washington has no intention of being soft. A ban was imposed last Monday on journalists' contacts with administration officials dealing with arms control issues. Any official who breaks the ban and gives an interview without special permission confirmed at the very top will do so at the cost of his job.

According to explanations which a high-ranking administration spokesman — who, nevertheless, sensibly requested that his name not be mentioned by the press — succeeded in giving prior to the imposition of the "sanctions," the White House is worried about "leaks of important information." Such leaks, the spokesman whispered confidentially to reporters, are advantageous to "the Russians," and therefore the ban being imposed is necessary for the sake of national security.

The spokesman keeps silent about many things. And mainly about the fact that there is no such thing as unapproved leaks of information in Washington. There is always someone behind any leak, be it a high-ranking official in the Department of State, the Pentagon, the CIA, or the White House. Examples? Plenty of them. One can recall in particular how, in November 1984, selected journalists were confidentially briefed on "active military preparations conducted by Nicaragua with help from the Soviet Union." The information proved to be false, but it was passed on to reporters by none other than Robert McFarlane, who at the time was assistant to the President for national security affairs, who, for the sake of persuasiveness, referred to "secret intelligence reports which have only just come to hand."

One can also recall how President Reagan himself, in yet another attempt to justify the malicious anti-Libyan campaign, said openly before tens of millions of viewers that the United States is engaged in the interception of diplomatic correspondence. These revelations shocked the U.S. intelligence community: After all, they made public information which is a secret of the secret service.

Finally, one can also recall the large stream of information on the contents of the "strictly confidential letter" on arms control issues which President Reagan sent to the Kremlin at the end of July. Bearing in mind that not more than about a dozen people at the very top echelons of the Washington administration were involved in composing the letter, one can suppose that the leak through the White House tried to give the impression that its stance was "constructive" did not spring by itself but was approved.

So, what is the reason behind the ban that has been imposed? One cannot give a precise answer. It is, however, impossible not to notice that a similar ban was imposed by the White House last January, immediately after M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put forward the program for complete nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. This was done, in particular, in order to relieve administration officials of the need to answer pointed questions by reporters who were trying to elucidate Washington's true attitude toward the termination of the arms race and toward nuclear disarmament.

Obviously, the White House does not want to come across any pointed questions now, when it is not prepared to reply to the initiatives by "those Russians" in any other way but "No! No! No!".

Daniloff Case as Diversion

LD181446 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 18 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" presented by Oleg Blinov]

[Excerpt] The sixth round of Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons opens today in Geneva. Our country's position is precise and clear. It is based on foreign policy directives as elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress, on the program set out by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 15 January on the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century in conditions when the arms race in space would be reliably averted. Unfortunately, on the U.S. side a readiness to move toward real accords is still not observable. On the contrary, Washington uses minor or fabricated problems to evade a solution to the very important issues of the present day. Thus, for example, across the ocean now emphasis is being placed on the incident of the detention in Moscow of the American correspondent, Daniloff, who was caught spying. Such a position is not in keeping with the demands of the world public. In the United States itself a campaign is growing, whose participants are urging the U.S. Government to follow the example of the USSR and stop nuclear tests. [passage omitted]

Sixth Round Opens

LD180930 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva, 18 Sep (TASS)—The sixth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments began here today.

Obukhov on Reagan Cut Offer

AU181408 Paris AFP in English 1405 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Excerpt] Geneva, Sept 18 (AFP) — U.S.-Soviet arms talks made little headway Thursday as the first session of the sixth round of Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) here ended after two hours, and a bilateral conference of experts was wound up for two months. At the NST negotiations neither side would comment after the inaugural session of the sixth round of talks.

The deputy head of the Soviet delegation, Aleksey Obukhov, said before the meeting he had not received official confirmation of President Reagan's widely-reported offer to ask for only a 30 per cent cut on strategic nuclear arms on both sides, instead of the 50 per cent he had originally asked for. The concession was termed "conciliatory" by White House staff when it was announced on Wednesday, but Mr. Obukhov said Thursday: "We don't yet know the American proposals. If introduced, they will be evaluated on their merits." He said the Soviet Union was more interested in a commitment from Washington to abide by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty for 15 to 20 years than concessions on strategic nuclear weapons.

The Reagan administation, keen on developing the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI or Star Wars) shield in space, which would be an anti-ballistic missile system, wants to be rid of the ABM Treaty within seven years at most. [passage omitted]

Chernyshev Contrasts Stance

LD181642 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 18 Sep 86

[TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Chernyshev: "Assumed Optimism and Dangerous Policy"]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Sep TASS — The White House statement devoted to the start of the sixth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva draws one's attention to the deliberate bias in stating the U.S. position, the prevalence of cheerful tones, and the complete disregard for the true state of affairs. According to the statement, Washington is allegedly full of resolution to reach agreements which will lead to reductions in nuclear arsenals. Washington has allegedly already demonstrated at Geneva that it is doing everything to effect reductions, and the U.S. position provides foundation for reaching an agreement.

Everything is being put upside down. In the first place, is there any foundation for the claims that the U.S. Administration wants any agreements? Are they needed by one who conducts a feverish nuclear arms race? The United States is implementing the "star wars" program, including the development [razrabotka] of its nuclear components; is conducting nuclear explosions and tests of antisatellite weapons; is creating [sozdayut] "third generation"-nuclear weapons; has started deploying [razvertyvaniye] new MX IBMs; is arming itself with nuclear-missile submarines one after the other; and is equipping strategic bombers, surface ships, and submarines with cruise missiles. Such measures can hardly testify to a wish to limit and reduce nuclear armaments.

Second, can someone who hitherto has obviously been happy to mark time have the right to voice optimism regarding the state of affairs at the talks and his own position? Also, a complete absence of desire to seek new approaches, making it possible to clear the obstacles on the road to mutually acceptable agreements, has been characteristic of Washington. The White House statement is completely silent on the question of nonmilitarization of space. No wonder. For the representatives of the U.S. Administration are continually stressing that the SDI program cannot serve as the subject of talks, and the United States intends to deploy a space ABM system. The proposals concerning strategic arms and medium-range nuclear weapons are aimed at one-sided military advantages for the United States, and are not calculated to be acceptable to the other side. Thus, at the talks themselves, Washington adheres to a patently deadlock situation.

Third, Washington distorts the position of the Soviet Union, or at best keeps silent about the fact that the USSR has a serious and responsible attitude to the talks, and words its proposals concretely, in businesslike fashion, taking into account the interests of the other side. The Soviet Union has taken quite a few steps in order to bring the positions closer on a broad spectrum of problems. For instance, at the fifth round it made a proposal to the United States to reach agreement on partial, interim measures which might be accepted right now. He who distorts or keeps silent about the constructive position of his talks partner obviously calculates to place the bla for the results of his own destructive policy onto the USSR.

In the nuclear-space age, time for making responsible decisions is fast running out. The USSR delegation is in Geneva with instructions to continue the search for ways leading to a quick mutually-acceptable unraveling of the questions preventing progress. It is to be hoped that Washington will at last respond in worthy fashion and will give a businesslike and constructive reply to the Soviet initiatives.

Zholkver Sees No Progress

LD190448 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 18 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vladimir Fadeyev]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons resumed in Geneva today. I ask our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to tell us about the situation there.

[Zholkver] The current round of the talks in Geneva is the sixth since their start in March of last year. Unfortunately, one must state that the matter has not moved an inch toward an agreement on arms reduction thus far.

Why? Fairly specific and constructive proposals by our country have been lying on the negotiating table for a long time in Geneva. They concern a complete ban on strike space weapons, a reduction by half of the Soviet and U.S. strategic weapons, and the liquidation of both U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. But what has the United States been concerned with all this time? With conducting one nuclear test after another, the majority of which are connected, as the U.S. military themselves admit, with the development [razrabotka] of space weapons, with producing new intercontinental MX missiles, which -- even circumventing the decision by the U.S. Congress -- are already being put on combat alert duty, and with placing new Pershing and cruise missiles in Western Europe even above the number announced beforehand. Where can one find time to think about developing a disarmament agreement when, as we can see, the arms race is in full swing!

However, the threat looming over mankind is too great to tolerate. And the Soviet Union is making every effort to move the talks in Geneva from the standstill. Halting nuclear tests would have enormous importance in creating favorable conditions for developing mutually acceptable accords. As you know, our country has once again, for the fourth time, extended the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts. If one could reach agreement with the United States to make the moratorium a bilateral one, this would not only strengthen mutual trust but also would prompt the solution of other questions, all the more so as our delegation in Geneva is far from taking an all-or-nothing stand and has submitted compromise proposals more than once.

It was officially announced in the White House yesterday that the U.S. delegation in Geneva will also submit some new proposals this time. Well, better late than never. Suspicions only arise from the fact that Western news agencies, while reporting about this, note that Washington in seeking not so much to reach an agreement in Geneva as to recover, as they put it, from the propagandist defeat in the fight against the Soviet moratorium. Time will tell, as the saying goes. As for the Soviet Union, the staunch struggle for curbing the arms race is not propaganda for us but a strategic line mapped out by the 27th party congress and again reiterated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the course of his current trip to Kuban.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1583

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS COMMENTARY ON U.S. REFUSAL TO RATIFY SALT II

LD171904 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 17 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogahev writes:

In 1984, during the election campaign people close to U.S. President Ronald Reagan constantly stressed in their public speeches that the head of the White House sincerely wished to go down in history as a peacemaker, that in case he was elected President of the United States for the second term, arms control would be problem number one in his activity.

The way this problem number one is solved by the current U.S. leadership and what it means when it speaks about arms control are shown by White House's actions as regards the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty which was signed before Reagan took office.

Given all the differences in the approaches of the USSR and the United States to problems of war and peace, which are brought about by the two states' socio-economic systems, there existed before 1981 a certain identity of the sides' views on the need to maintain stability, on the danger of the unconstrained race in the destabilizing types of weapons.

Both USSR's leaders and officials of the previous U.S. Administration's sought to avoid situations under which vital decisions would be taken in a matter of minutes, when developments could escape control threatening with catastrophic consequences. It is precisely this concurrence of views on problems of stability that had made it possible to reach by 1979 a number of important agreements on bridling the arms race, including the SALT-2 treaty.

The 1979 treaty because the result of lthe sides reasonable compromise. Eager to erect effective barriers in the way of building up nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union met the American side halfway on a number of all-important issues.

American specialists highly evaluated the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty which, among other things, limited the number of nuclear warheads on strategic missiles, set the ceiling on the number of delivery vehicles, banned interference with the activity of observation satellites, excluded the possibility of deploying some classes of missiles which harbour particular danger and stipulated other measures which would substantially scale down the risk of a world nuclear war.

Washington, however, has refused under far-fetched pretexts to ratify this important agreement.

The new administration which moved into the White House in 1981, announced that the SALT-2 treaty was "fatally flawed". Its officials emphasized that the United States did not consider itself to be bound by the treaty terms.

Faced with pressure from the world public, however, the White House made a statement in 1982 to the effect that the United States would not undertake actions that would undercut SALT-2. Now, it has become perfectly obvious that the Reagan administration had never intended to observe this agreement.

In May 1986, when U.S. military programmes began for the first time breaking out of SALT-2 bounds, Washington announced at once that the treaty was "dead."

The decision by the White House sparked off outrage among the world public. Even the most loyal "Atlanticists" in NATO West European countries called in question its wisdom. The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress voted for banning the release of funds for developing armaments to be deployed in breach of the SALT-2 treaty, a move which enraged President Reagan.

What is the reason behind Washington's position with respect to the treaty which, in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of experts, in beneficial to the United States?

The point is that the U.S. Administration wants to dismantle the last barrier to the arms race. The fact that SALT-2 establishes strategic parity does not suit it. Washington now wants to secure for itself a free reign to realize its illusory plans of gaining military superiority. Having discarded the SALT-2, the United States has embarked on the dangerous road of undermining international security, magnifying the threat of a nuclear war which can have catastrophic consequences for the peoples of our planet, including for the American people.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1586

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY SPOKESMAN DENIES MISSILE CRASH

AU181434 Paris AFP in English 1428 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, Sept 18 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union thursday denied a U.S. defense report which said that an unarmed Soviet ballistic missile had crashed in northern China last week.

"One of our missiles was launched during regular maneuvers but it did not go beyond the Soviet border," said Boris Pyadishev, a Foreign Ministry spokesman.

China has until now refused to comment on the report, which said that a SSN8 missile, without a warhead, launched from a Delta-type submarine in the Barents Sea towards a distant target in Soviet Territory north of China, veered off course.

The U.S. report said it swerved south and came down close to the Amur River, which marks the Soviet-Chinese border.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1586

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

USSR MISSILE TESTS--Moscow, 17 Sep (TASS)--Carrier rockets will be launched in the Soviet Union to the regions of the Pacific Ocean during the period between 20 September and 4 October 1986. These will be confined to a circumference with a radius of 70 nautical and 174 degrees 20 minutes east longitude; and 14 degrees 10 minutes north latitude and 175 degrees 10 minutes east longitude. TASS is authorized to state that in order to ensure safety, the USSR Government asks the governments of other states which use sea and air routes in the Pacific Ocean to instruct relevant bodies so that sea and air vessels should not enter these regions and the airspace above them daily between 1200 and 1900 local time. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 17 Sep 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1586

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR LT COL: UK COURTS 'NUCLEAR ENSLAVEMENT' WITH STEALTH BASE

PM150927 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Yurkin "Rejoinder": "Suiting the Pentagon"].

[Text] The Pentagon is bending over backward to obtain a special weapon — the so-called "invisible" aircraft being developed under the "Stealth" program. It is claimed that this new technology is the "greatest technical leap of the century, of substantial military importance." And it will allegedly permit the United States to acquire "manned and unmanned vehicles which existing air defense systems are inadequately equipped to detect and destroy" — that was how the Pentagon propagandized the news back in 1990.

The U.S. officials responsible intend to deploy the first consignment of 30 "Stealth" reconnaissance aircraft not at home but far away, albeit somewhere where they will still feel at home — the USAF base at Lakenheath, Suffolk, in eastern England. "Their arrival," THE MAIL ON SUNDAY newspaper, which maintains close links with the New World, state, "will mean that Britain is again at the frontline of U.S. defense, as was the case in the raid on Libya."

Yes, Britain's senior NATO partner is again giving it an extremely unseemly role. And a risky one, too. For, as is well known, U.S. "Stealth" technology is being used to create not only a reconnaissance aircraft but first and foremost a nuclear weapons platform — the ATB strategic bomber. Series production of the ATB is planned to start in 1988-1980.

The very "invisibility" — or rather, the low detectability of the "Stealth" aircraft — is fraught with extremely dangerous consequences. Just ponder this simple task: How is one to distingusih a "Stealth" reconnaissance aircraft from a nuclear-capable "Stealth"? And how would any of you readers act if you saw an "invisible" plane in the air headed for your hometown? For your further consideration may I suggest the following opinion of General B. Rogers, supreme allied commander, NATO Forces, Europe: "The only possible way of detecting whether an attack is being launched with nuclear weapons or not is to wait for the first large nuclear mushroom cloud to appear."

And the second question: Would you wait disinterestedly for the "result" of the flight or take retaliatory measures commensurate with the situation? And only against the aircraft? Or also against those who sent it? In other words, those who hand over their territory for U.S. militarist ventures are taking yet another step toward U.S. nuclear enslavement. An extremely dangerous step into "invisibility," so to speak — into nowhere. Not to see that would be a crime.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1588

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. ATTEMPTING TO UNDERMINE BW CONVENTION

PM111118 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Second Edition p 3

[N. Sinyavin article under the rubric "The Facts Expose": "Playing with Death"]

[Text] In 1972 the United States signed the International Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. Administration spokesmen assert that the United States unswervingly abides by this convention. Unfortunately, the facts attest to just the opposite. An article published by the American journal SCIENCE gives a graphic impression of the Pentagon's far-reaching plans in this field.

...In August 1984, the day after Congress ended work before the summer vaction, (Kvirsh), assistant to the secretary of the army, made what was at first glance an extremely modest request of the legislators. In his letter he proposed redistributing 66 million dollars from the Pentagon budget. At the very end of the list of new programs proposed by him was the creation of a laboratory to study aerosols on the territory of the Dugway military test range in Utah.

In accordance with the established procedure in such cases (Kvirsh's) request was examined without a formal hearing, vote, or discussion. [paragraph continues]

"It seemed that there was nothing in the document to arouse suspicion or doubt," recalled Senator Sasser, who was one of the four participants in the examination of the request. However, it became clear that this was precisely the impression that the Pentagon figures had been hoping to produce in order to avoid the procedure of an official discussion in Congress.

Later, after attentively analyzing the (Kvirsh) proposal, Sasser came to the conclusion that Congress had in this way approved an unprecedented expansion in military programe in the sphere of bacteriological weapons. To all intents and purposes, he admitted, the four senators had legalized the creation of a powerful center whose main tark was to study particularly dangerous aerosol biological substances such as pathogens of the most serious hemorrhagic fevers and the Lassa, (Ebol), Marburg, and other viruses.

The Pentagon is giving the new laboratory the leading role in preparations for bacteriological warfare. Sasser openingly stated that the laboratory is being created exclusively for research into biological nd toxic weapons banned under the 1972 International Convention. The senator has protested his own approval of the project, which has generated furious attacks from the Pentagon.

The laboratory being created by the Pentagon for aerosol means of waging bacteriological warfare, SCIENCE points out, is only a small part of the global program to modernize and expand the potential to test extremely toxic and strong chemical and biological substances at the Dugway test range -- a military base covering 113,000 hectares. A complex is now under construction there for studying particiularly dangerous viruses and bacteria that cause fatal diseases.

Many specialists who were approached by SCIENCE stated that the aerosol laboratory making up part of the complex could be used to create genetically altered viruses and bacteria which would be highly resistant to medicines -- in other words, to create offensive bacteriological weapons prohibited under the 1972 convention. The most probable direction of the work is to tranfer the genes of pathogenic micro-organisms to bacteria able to propagate rapidly among limited populations or ethnic groups. It is worth noting that even after the torm of scandal and the revelation of ignoble manipulations in Congress, the U.S. Department of the Army is insisting that its application be satisfied. "The request is still with Congress, and we are hopeful that a positive decision will be taken on it," department spokesman Lieutenant Colonel (Koklashauer) repeats from day to day with a soldier's burly persistence.

Having rejected observance of the SALT II treaty on trumped-up pertexts, the Washington administration is now clearly setting its sights on undermining the 1972 International Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. In beginning construction at the Dugway test range, the Pentagon is taking a demonstrative and dangerous step in this direction.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA HITS PENTAGON AIDE'S REMARKS ON BACTERIOLOGICAL ARMS

PM261843 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

["Our Commentary" by Vladimir Mikhaylov: "Greatness and Insignificance"]

[Test] The liberation of earth from devastating epidemics has always been considered a feat. Monuments marking the victory over the plague still stand in Europe's ancient cities. Generation upon generation add the adjective "great" to the names of Pasteur, Koch, Mechnikov, Virkhov, Gamaleya, and many other conquerors of infectious diseases. To judge by the latest reports, however, people in the Pentagon have decided to radically change established usage and to award this lofty title to the actual carriers of epidemics.

It may sound monstrous, but this is precisely what is said in a statement by a Department of Defense spokesman, only just declassified in Washington. Deputy Assistant Secretary Douglas Feith declared: "New technology has undermined former ideas about biological weapons... Now we are saying that bacteriological weapons made on the basis of new technology can become truly great." This statement at the session of a subcommittee of a U.S. House of Representatives special committee testifies, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, that "some groupings within the Reagan Administration, and particularly in the Pentagon, are evaluating biological weapons in a new light."

So what has changed? "Previously," the newspaper reports, "the United States rejected the use of biological weapons because they are difficult to control and could cause infection on both sides.... Moreover, the existence of such weapons in the United States would encourage small countries to consider their usefulness as a... 'cheap nuclear bomb.'" Now, as Feith has reassured congressmen, these fears would apparently disappear as a result of "striking successes" by the United States. There were no moral obstacles before, nor are there any now. The determining factor, the Pentagon spokesman confirmed, is only "the exceptionally great military importance" of viruses, bacteria, and toxins.

To judge by everything, the statement by the military department's spokesman is a prologue to a scenario, already worked out in the United States, for pushing through new means of destruction. Matters were presented there as if "the Russians are already designing such weapons" and that "the Pentagon is

alarmed." The next American strike is evidently planned against the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons. This convention was spoken of at the subcommittee session as allegedly having "serious shortcomints which do not lead themselves to correction."

Thus we have the first visible symptoms of Washington's "infection" by yet another "superdeadly" mass destruction weapon, a vague idea of which can perhaps be obtained only from medieval accounts of the plague. Formerly it was believed that the prime causes of such "infection" in the world of profits were greed and the readiness to commit any crime under the slogan "the end justifies the means." Now there are obvious signs of insanity.

A struggle to implement the great program for delivering our planet from nuclear weapons by the end of this century is spreading in all continents at present. The Soviet Union, which put this program forward, has taken a new and decisive step by extending the moratorium on nuclear tests with a view to putting an end to any improvements of this terrible tool of annihilation. But the world of gold threatens to bring back to earth the horrors of wholesale death in the Middle Ages. Is there a limit to the perversion of human thinking? Or is there no such thing in a society where every invention by human genius is transformed into an evil for the inhabitants of the earth?

/9738
CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR REPORTS, COMMENTARY ON GENEVA BW CONFERENCE

IZVESTIYA on Agenda, USSR Stance

PM100807 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Sep 86 Morning edition p 4

[V. Kuznetsov Geneva dispatch: "To Increase the Convention's Effectiveness"]

[Text] Delegations from more than one hundred states which have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction are meeting on Monday 8 September for a second conference to review its effect.

The convention came into force on 26 March 1975 and is generally recognized as a concrete measure in the sphere of limiting the arms race. The signatories to this important international agreement pledged never to develop, produce, stockpile, or otherwise acquire or retain microbial or other biological agents or toxins, whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, productive, or other peaceful purposes.

Thus, one of the most "diabolical means" for the mass destrucion of people, the Swiss newspaper LE COURRIER has stressed, is outlawed on the basis of the comprehensive, up-to-date agreement within the UN framework. It has been proven in practice that, despite difficulties and obstacles, it is possible to create an international legal mechanism limiting the arms race.

This mechanism gained approval at the first conference to review the effect of the convention (3-21 March 1980 in Geneva). In the final declaration the participants confirmed their unshakable determination in the interests of humanity to completely rule out the possiblity of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins being used as weapons.

The present conference's agenda covers 14 issues. The plenary sessions and working commissions will examine various aspects of problems connected with the convention's effect and the observance of its provisions. Work will also be continued on the approval of a final document. The Soviet Union ratified the convention on 11 February 1975, -- 2 months before it was signed. This attests to our serious approach and desire to ban this type of mass destruction weapon. Our country -- and this is repeatedly stressed in official documents -- strictly observes all the provisions of the convention.

Research and development in the Soviet Union involving microorganisms and toxins pursues exclusively peaceful aims and is carried out in the interests of public health care, the microbiological industry, and agricultural production. In this connection our country is in favor of building broad international cooperation in the sphere of biotechnology and the peaceful development of biological science.

Prior to the beginning of the conference the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute presented the participants with the research work "Biological and Toxin Weapons Today," which contains an appeal to take additional measures to increase the effectiveness of the convention.

Conference Opens

LD082321 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva September 8 TASS — The second conference for analyzing the effect of the convention of the banning of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and for their destruction opened here today.

By today the convention had been signed by over 100 countries. This is actually the first document which permitted to take away from the arsenals of the countries a whole class of extremely dangerous mass destruction weapons. The task of the conference is to consolidate the regime of the convention and to promote a further expansion of international cooperation in the sphere of peaceful development of biology and the use of its achievements in the interests of socio-economic, scientific and technological process.

Report on Israelyan Address

LD091305 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva September 9 TASS — Tass Correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

A general debate has opened today at the conference to review compliance with the convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons.

In a message addressed to the delegates to the conference, Javier Perez de Cuellar, U.N. secretary general, pointed out that "the biological weapons convention constitutes the first and so far the only international legally binding instrument by which states parties have undertaken to prohibit and prevent the development, production and stockpiling of an entire category of weapons of mass destruction. The convention has, therefore, aptly been called the world's first disarmament treaty.

"It continues to serve as a guide to the international community in its efforts to achieve genuine disarmament measures regarding other types of weapons and their systems, it furnishes an example of how mutually acceptable solutions can be found to most intricate international problems".

President of the second review conference -- Winifred Lang (Austria) has called for strengthening the convention as a reliable instrument ensuring the prevention of the arms race in an important field and real disarmament measures.

The Soviet Union sees the main objective of the conference in contributing in every way possible to strengthening the convention and effectively implementing all of its provision, Viktor Israelyan, the head of the Soviet delegation said. This document can serve as an example of a successful resolution of intricate security problems and is evidence that genuine disarmament is not a Utopia, but quite a feasible task. It is part of the complex the head of the Soviet delegation said. This document can serve as an example of a successful resolution of intricate security problems and is evidence that genuine disarmament is not a Utopia, but quite a feasible task. It is part of the complex of the agreements and treaties in effect in the field of limitation of the arms race. It is the direct duty of all states to preserve and increase that complex, in the first place of the states which bear the main responsibility for maintaining peace and international security.

As the USSR representative stressed, the Soviet Union has no bacteriological (biological) agents or toxins, weapons, equipment or delivery vehicles. It strictly abides by all the other articles of the convention. The Soviet Union's research and development with the use of microorganisms and toxins pursues solely peaceful aims and is done in the interests of public health protection and of the microbiological industry and agriculture.

Over the years of its existence, the convention has fully proved its effectiveness and viability. The documents prepared for the session are proof that the provisions of that agreement are universal and capacious and apply to any microorganisms both of natural and artificial origin, which could be viewed as agents of warfare.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, the convention could be strengthened by a further broadening of the circle of participating states, its speediest ratification by the states, which have not yet done so, as well as a further development of international cooperation in the field of peaceful uses of biological science for the benefit of peace and progress.

V. Israelyan also urged the participants in the conference to declare for the speediest completion of the talks on the prohibition and scrapping of chemical weapons.

U.S. 'Fabrications' Condemned

LD092148 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Sep 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The second conference examining the compliance with the Convention on the Ban on Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological, Biological, and Toxic Weapons and Their Destruction started its work in Geneva. [passage omitted]

The Soviet delegation has resolutely condemned the attempts of a U.S. representative to cast aspersions on our side by fabrications about alleged violations of the international convention by Moscow. The USSR has strictly observed and observes all provisions of the document, the head of the Soviet delegation stressed. [passage omitted]

U.S. Position on Ban

LD102325 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 10 Sep 86

[From the "International Dairy" program; Vladimir Tsvetov commentary]

[Text] A conference examining the functioning of the convention banning bacteriological weapons is continuing in Geneva. I want to ask political observer Vladimir Tsvetov to talk about the convention and the attitudes to it of the Soviet Union and the United States. From the first days of the work of the conference, one can already judge the positions of both the countries.

Indeed, the positions of the USSR and the United States have revealed themselves with the utmost clarity. But first I would like to say a few words about the convention itself, the functioning of which presenting is being examined at the conference in Geneva. The convention on banning the development, production, and accumulation of stocks of bacteriological, biological, and toxic weapons and on their destruction, was approved by the UN General Assembly in 1971. The convention went into force in 1975. As yet, this is the sole international legal document which bans an entire class of weapons of mass destruction. Despite the opposition of the United States, the General Assembly succeeded in adopting this document. A not inconsiderable role was played hereby scientists, who, on UN instructions, studied the lethal nature of bacteriological weapons and proved irrefutably that this weaponry, delivered by just one strategic bomber, is able to destroy everything living on an area of 100,000 sq. km.

The Soviet Union rigorously observes the convention. Our country does not have bacteriological, biological, or toxic weaponry, and it is not being developed. This defines the position of the Soviet delegation at the conference in Geneva. It proposes the strengthening of the convention in defining more precisely that its prohibiting clauses should apply to any micro-organisms, of both natural and artificial origin, which could be used as a weapon. Apart from this, the Soviet delegation calls, in the development of the convention, for the expansion of international cooperation in the field of the peaceful use of biological science, for the benefit of the world [mir] and progress.

However the U.S. side has a different position. Having falsely accused the Soviet Union of possessing bacteriological weapons -- there were no facts cited since they do not exist -- the U.S. delegation intends to attempt to strike at the convention itself, which, as the Americans stated, cannot protect against the threat of using bacteriological weapons and is therefore dead. The real cause for such a position lies in the following: If since 1949 and up to the time of the adoption of the convention, the United States conducted 239 atmospheric tests on bacteriological weapons, then after 1971 it did not bring itself to do this, but it continued laboratory development of bacteriological weapons; you see, verification [proverka] of them is not possible.

From time to time kthe United States took research beyond the confines of laboratories. In 1981, for example, it carried out a secret bacteriological attack on Cuba, spreading dengue fever on the island. In 1982 it used bacteriological weapons against partisans in Guatemala. Now the limits of laboratory work have become cramped for the United States. It wants to have a bacteriological Nevada, side by side with the nuclear one. It is for the sake of this that the United States has come up with the idea of undermining the convention banning bacteriological weapons. You have probably noticed, comrades, that the method for undermining an international legal document is known to you. Indeed, the United States intends by a similar method to abandon the SALT II treaty, which limits strategic weapons, and the treaty on antimissile defense. I think, however, that this time the United States dare not to do this, for otherwise it will set itself against the whole world. The convention will remain alive. The world community will not wish to give up the first and perhaps most effective international document hindering the expansion of the arms race. The convention serves as a convincing example of the fact that states can successfully resolve the problems of security and that real disarmament is not a utopia.

Israelyan, Lowitz Addresses Conference

PM131320 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by unnamed own correspondent: "Switzerland: To Strengthen the Convention in Every Possible Way!"]

[Excerpts] Geneva — Chairman Vinfrid Lang (Austria) banged his hammer to open the general debate at the Second Conference to Review the Working of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

The USSR, V.L. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation, declared in his speech, sees it as the conference's chief task to help strengthen the convention in evey possible way. The convention's significance for peace and international security can hardly be overestimated. Above all, it essentially bans an entire class of very dangerous mass destruction weapons, whose use at any point on the globe could lead under modern conditions to unpredictable consequences.

The Soviet Union, V.L. Israelyan pointed out, does not possess any bacteriological (biological) agents or toxins or carry out research and development aimed at creating [sozdaniye] and improving these weapons. It has never passed bacteriological (biological) agents, toxins, weapons, or delivery vehicles to anyone or encouraged any states to produce them or to acquire them by any other means.

Research and development in the Soviet Union involving the use of microorganisms and toxins pursues exclusively peaceful ends and is carried out in the interests of health care, the microbiological industry, and agricultural production.

The speech by Donald Lowitz, head of the U.S. delegation, sounded a sharply dissonant note. After rattling off the standard phrases about support for the convention, the American delegate tried to accuse the Soviet Union of nonexistent violations of its provisions, dragging out onto the rostrum the stories of "yellow rain" in Southeast Asia which have been refuted by the international community.

He also pursued this line at the press conference held after his speech. But his replies to questions even from American correspondents showed that the U.S. envoy muddles up his facts and is incompetent on questions of bacteriological weapons, as evidenced by his admission that he has not read the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's authoritative studies refuting the U.S. Administration's propaganda fabrications.

"How do you assess that speech?" I put this question to Linda Bullard, an observer at the conference for U.S. public organizations.

"American officials," she replied, "must adduce proof of their version or totally cease the needless ballyhoo over accusations. They only discredit the serious work of strengthening the convention. And it must be strengthened, for the Pentagon uses any loopholes to conduct dangerous experiments with bacteriological weapons."

A recent statement by Douglas Feith, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense, attests that these weapons have entered the Pentagon's arsenal. He rained down attacks on the convention, clearly pursuing the aim of torpedoing it and unleashing a biological weapons race. Last year alone the Pentagon conducted approximately 75 experiments in the sphere of genetic engineering, spending more than $68 million on it.

Alekseyev Commentary

OW120803 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 11 Sep 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Sergey Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] Currently, a second conference is being held in Switzerland to examine the effectiveness of the convention to ban the development, manufacture, and stockpiling of bacteriological and chemical weapons and their elimination. Our commentary:

[Alkeskeyev] Hello comrades. One of the main efforts in the struggle against the arms race and in reducing the dangers of war is directed at banning bacteriological and chemical weapons. An honest, constructive approach -- an approach which has little in common with the one being taken in the first days of the aforementioned forum in Switzerland by a number of Western participants, above all, by the United States -- is needed for an expedient solution to this problem.

The United States representative's speech at the conference consisted almost entirely of unsubstantiated accusations against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Allegedly, during its entire 14-year existence, the Soviet Union has violated the convention by constantly increasing bacteriological and chemical weapons stockpiles. These are reportedly being used in Afghanistan, Laos, and Cambodia. This was stated in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, as far back as 1969, was the first to offer to include the question of the complete ban of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the U.N. General Assembly agenda and introduced the draft of the corresponding international convention.

This happened despite the fact -- often proved by, among others, various United Nations commissions which visited Afghanistan and Southeast Asia -- that Washington's assertion that Soviet chemical weapons are being used is unjustified. And, this occurred at a time when the U.S. chemical warfare in Indochina -- the negative ramifications of which are still felt to this very day -- is still vividly remembered.

Why was it necessary for the U.S. representative in Geneva to yet again drag out the old, and much belabored fraud, which all people, including most Americans, are tired of hearing about? First of all, this is the same old attempt to somehow justify its own chemical warfare preparations. This year, the Pentagon was allocated a record $10 billion for this. There is one more implication: The United States today is striving, by all means available, to divert the attention of the world from our latest peace initiative -- the extension of the nuclear test moratorium. That is why they are heaping mounds of lies and slander.

U.S. Claims Regarded

PM171522 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[A. Golts article: "Why a Lie Is Being Resurrected"]

[Text] An unusual exhibition is currently on show in Washington. Fakes of pictures by famous artists are on display. It is a pity, however, that the organizers of this exhibition have confined themselves to fakes in the sphere of art. After all, plenty of fakes are fabricated in the United States in other spheres. Take international affairs. The falsifications fabricated by the CIA, the Pentagon, and the State Department could fill a museum. Among them a special place could be claimed by the numerous insinuations about "Soviet yellow rain."

This malicious lie has surfaced, once again, in the speech of the U.S. representative at the second conference being held in Geneva to examine the operation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacterioloical (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction.

Why was it necessary to resurrect this old calumny? All it is an unconcealed attempt to shift the blame. Under the auspices of the Pentagon, numerous laboratories and scientific centers have long been working in the United States, allegedly on developing methods to protect troops against bacteriological weapons. In effect, experiments with new types of morbific micro-organisms are conducted at these establishments. This year alone the Pentagon has allocated 4.3 million dollars for a special center for toxin research at Jefferson University. At the same time a laboratory is being set up at the Army proving ground at Dugway.

Furthermore, there are numerous indications that the United States has already used "silent death" in its subversive operations against sovereign states. The epidemic of "dengue" fever which affected thousands of Cubans in 1981 was the result of a subversive U.S. operation. This was proved by much scientific data and the testimony of the mercenaries who carried out this crime. E. Arocena, one of the ringleaders of the Omega-7 counterrevolutionary organization, while on trial in New York for murder, told of participating in this sinister operation. During the same year, 1981, (Nlin), a U.S. biologist, was expelled from Pakistan in connection with a scandal which broke over sininster experiments with virus-infected mosquitoes that he had conducted in that country.

At present research in preparation for bacteriological warfare has entered a new stage in the United States. Feith, a ranking Pentagon official, stated this quite plainly whiel speaking in Congress. "It is now absolutely clear," he trumpeted, "that bacteriological weapons manufactured with recourse to the latest technology could acquire extraordinarily great military importance. We have change our view about the military usefulness of bacteriological weapons. Bacteriological weapons could become truly great."

If this is true, Washington should spare no effort to reinforce the convention banning the production and stockpiling of bacteriological weapons. However, far from it! On the eve of the conference articles have appeared in the U.S. press in which unnamed U.S. representatives claimed that the convention is "useless." According to THE WASHINGTON TIMES one of them even declared that it is "impossible to ensure effective verification of the observance of this convention."

And to corroborage this the old lie about "yellow rain" was dragged out again. The logic is highly characteristic of Washington's thinking: "If we cannot prove that Russian toxin weapons are being used in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan, it means that the convention is ineffective."

Of late the United States has resorted to similar tricks more than once. So, for instance, to begin with there was talk about the SALT II treaty being "flawed," then far-fetched accusations were made claiming that the USSR was violating the treaty. But soon it became clear that Washington itself had decided to violate the treaty. Judging by appearances, the efforts to undermine the convention banning bacteriological weapons pursue the same aim.

And it is highly illustrative that Washington is trying to discredit a document which would essentially ban a whole class of highly dangerous mass annihilation weapons, a document which could serve as an example of the successful solution of complex problems in the sphere of security.

Addressing the conference, the Soviet representative noted that the USSR has no bacteriological weapons at all. Our country adheres strictly to all the articles of the convention and seeks to strengthen it. As for the spurious report about Soviet "yellow rain," (J. Lenard), head of the U.S. delegation to the talks which led to the conclusion of the convention, expressed himself pertinently on the subject. He described U.S. conduct in this respect as disgraceful. "It is our duty as parties to the convention," he emphasized, "not to raise accusations that cannot be proved." It is high time for Washington to heed this kind of sober view.

'Far-Fetched Accusations'

LD182116 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva, 18 Sep (TASS)--TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The general debate has ended here at the current conference to review the implementation of the Convention on the Ban on Bacteriological (Biological Weapons).

During the debate almost all the participants pointed out the great importance of the convention and said that it was essential to treat carefully the first measure of real disarmament and to contribute to consolidating the convention and to effective implementation of all its provisions.

The participants in the debate in the same way unanimously spoke out in favour of imposing a ban on chemical weapons as soon as possible.

However, one is getting the impression that such a positive attitude of mind at the conference is not to the liking of individual delegations and, first of all, that of the United Staes.

At the very beginning of the work, Donald Lowitz, the leader of the U.S. delegation, stated his "concern" with regard to the observance of the convention. He did not give any facts or proofs which would justify the "concern" — for the simple reason that such do not exist.

Neverthless, subsequently, U.S. representatives and some of their closest allies went further along the lines of far-fetched accusations levelled at the Soviet Union for alleged violations of the main clauses of the convention.

The delegation of the USSR categorically rejected the accusations that are an invention from beginning to end and pursure the aim of aggravating the situation at the conference and at using it to fan up anti-Soviet propaganda.

The Soviet delegation again showed its readiness for a joint search for mutuall acceptable solution and, with due regard for other delegations' wishes concerning the consolidation of the control machinery, submitted a proposal to work out and adopt an additional protocal to the convention. Such a protocal would envisage measures to invigorate the system of control.

Viktor Israelyan, the leader of the USSR delegation, voiced conviction that those who are really interested in raising the effectiveness of the convention, and not in spreading every kind of fables, would support the proposal.

Talks With UK Delegation

LD182124 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Text] London September 18 TASS -- Soviet-British consultations were held today in connection with the talks on elaborating a convention on banning and destroying stockpiles of chemical weapons

The Soviet delegation was headed by Yu. Nazarkin, head of a USSR Foreign Ministry department. The delegation met with Tim Renton, British minister of state, Foreign and Commonwealth office.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA: REPORT ON USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS BY DRA REBELS

PM101230 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Sep 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Own correspondent D. Meshchaninov dispatch: "Afghanistan: Poisoners of Wells. The West Supplies the Dushmans With Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] Kabul — The Western special services are supplying the Afghan counterrevolutionary rabble not only with conventional but also with chemical weapons. Tangible proof of this is provided by exhibits at the display of material captured by the DRA Armed Forces in Kabul, Lowgar, and Vardak Provinces in literally the last few days. They include larger-caliber machine guns and submachine guns, mortars and grenades, shells of different calibers, and antiaircraft missiles including British "Blue Point" surface-to-air type missiles. A special type of weapon is also among them: Various kinds of mines and grenades charged with toxins.

Chemical weapons started reaching the dushmans from across the border with Pakistan in 1980, Colonel Mohammad Nazem, chief of the DRA Defense Ministry Chemical Service, said. Gangs armed with U.S. -made CS gas grenades were first reported in the vicinity of Herat in March of that year. A month later these very same grenades, similar to tin cans in appearance, were used by dushmans in Herat itself against people's militia staffers.

Soon after the rout of a gang led by Alia Kayvan, known by the nickname Gonda — Phalange — in the region of Khowst, unusual pencil boxes containing 30 gray tablets each were discovered in secret caches. It was established that they were made of the powerful toxic substance "Phostoxin," designed to poison water sources and to contaminate foodstuffs. It is obvious that Gonda did not acquire the tablets from some peddler in Peshawar's "black market." The poison was made by professional "chemists" in the United States, evidence of which was provided by the packaging and the markings on the pencil boxes.

In 1982 the dushmans used toxins to commit a disgusting atrocity in the capital. About 100 young girls, students at a lyceum in the capital, were brought to a Kabul hospital suffering from acute poisoning. It was ascertained that the bandits had demanded that they boycott their studies and, when this did not happen, had poured poison into the school's drinking water tanks. Fourteen girls died a painful death and dozens more remained invalids for life. I was well aware of this terririst action. I asked whether there have been any instances of toxins being used in combat.

There have been some cases, M. (Nazem) replied. For example, Colonel Rahmatullah's unit was subjected to direct chemical attack in Nangarhar Province in 1984. In an attempt to break out of encirclement, the gang released four mines charged with toxins. The dushmans failed to breakout, but several fighters from Rahmatullah's subunit were affected. Their symptoms were weeding, asphyxia, violent retching, and loss of hearing within approximately 1 hour -- typical symptoms of a chemical strike.

It was in 1984 that mines, grenades, and bullets charged with chemical substances started arriving in Pakistan from the United States and some other Western countries in larger quantities than before, according to testimony by former counterrevolutionaries who voluntariy switched to the side of the people's government. The weapons were later sent on to Afghanistan, where they were intended to be used both against the DRA Armed Forces and against the civilian population.

Furthermore, counterrevolutionary leaders entrenched in Pakistan demanded that their "fighters" sent to Afghanistan not only use chemical weapons but also gather factual data on the results of their use. Photographs of the victims of toxins, tape recordings of eyewitness testimony, and samples of contaminated water and soil were to be sent back to Peshawar. In order to obtain more detailed and convincing "data," the dushmans were instructed not to spare the civilian population.

The counterrevolution was thus planning not only to damage Afghanistan's national economy and population, but also to present its own crimes as "incontrovertible proof" of the use of toxins by the Afghan Army and the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops. The bandits' leaders have not abandoned these plans even now. Evidence of this can be seen in the chemical weapons captured during recent combat operations and in documents in the possession of DRA State Security organs.

Rabbani, leader of the "Islamic Association of Afghanistan," is displeased with the fact that his subordinates in Herat Province have hitherto failed to supply evidence of the use of toxins by the Afghan Army and the Soviet forces. But where is this evidence to be found when it sumply does not exist. On the other hand, there is plentiful evidence that the counterrevolutionaries are being supplied with modern chemical weapons. The captured materiel stamped "Made in"...the United States, Britain, and the FRG offers tangible evidence against those who are behind the dushmans.

While one of the most topical questions of our time -- the banning and destruction of chemical weapons -- is being discussed both in the United Nations and at other international forums, the United States and some other Western countries are supplying these deadly weapons to the dushmans, who are waging an undeclared war against their own people.

Such is the truth, and no "tribunals," "hearings," and "trials" of the DRA, organized for the purpose of falsifying the facts, can cover up the Western countries' complicity in the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan or hide the truth from the broad strata of the international public.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1585

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA RIDICULES ANGOLA CW CHARGE

PM151901 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[B. Pilyatskin commentary: "Black Leaves and Black Conscience"]

[Text] Goebbels, the super-specialist in disinformation, loved to repeat: "A list must be monstrous for it to be believed." Times change, but the morals of the "well poisoners" remain the same. From the tropical Angolan jungle American ABC television correspondent J. Hickey has sent a heart-chilling SOS: the people of Jonas Savimbi, leader of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) detachments, are being poisoned.

No, not this time by newspaper epithets, which have long been tightly latched onto the cutthroats who murder innocent Angolan citizens. The rebels are being poisoned, as it transpires, in the literal sense of the word--by chemical bombs. What has Angola gotten them from? Directly from Moscow, of course. "Savimbi," the American commentator reports from his den in the forest, "is accusing the Soviet Union of supplying Angola--where Marxists are in power--with toxic substances."

Whenever Angolan subunits strike another perceptible blow against UNITA, which is on the payroll of the CIA and the Republic of South Africa (RSA), Savimbi looks for "explanation" to justify himself before his chiefs, who generously supply him with everything he needs. Either he had to lay down his arms because it was raining, or, conversely, drought was the impediment--the savanna burned down and there was nowhere to hide.

On this occasion in the Angolan Army's successful operations against UNITA the object of blame is... the black leaves on the trees. The terrorist chemicals, of course, have infallibly determined that the leaves have turned this color solely because "the Russians are using chemical weapons against our fighters." It would appear that it is precisely because of these leaves that these "fighters" are fleeing the battlefield and giving themselves up.

The fact that the UNITA chief is engaging in shameless fabrication and poisoning the international atmosphere with his stories is part of the normal course of events. What is surprising is something else: the fact that certain American mass information media are so blinded by malice toward revolutionary Angola and its friends that they publicly relish the alchemist's brew about chemical bombs.

Nevertheless, in order to give some semblance of objectivity to his report, the ABM correspondent concluded it with the words: "However, he (Savimbi) has not provided any evidence of chemical poisoning." Nevertheless, the American television company has poisoned the air with another dose of slander....

/9738
CSO: 5200/1585

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY ON SOVIET PEACE EFFORTS IN CDE

HK170345 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 13 Sep 86 p 6

["Roundup" by Reporter Gu Yaoming: "Conditional Concessions Cannot Cover Up the Contention"]

[Excerpts] The final round of talks at the European Disarmament Conference in Stockholm will conclude on 19 September. With this date drawing near, people are paying more attention to the state of the conference which has lasted for 2 and 1/2 years. [passage omitted]

In view of European countries' general desire for peace and disarmament, the Soviet Union has launched an extensive peace offensive against the United States. [paragraph continues]

At the Stockholm meeting, the Soviets have also shown a tolerant attitude which was different from their previous attitude. They have made a series of concessions in the past 2 months. To prevent itself from being put in a passive position, the United States has also made some concessions. The United States has agreed to inform the Warsaw Pact about the movements of U.S. troops from its own territory to Western Europe; while the Soviet Union has expressed its willingness to allow the other side to inspect its territory for military activities. These two points were the most knotty issues at the previous talks. Participants are now glad to see that the two countries can reach a compromise on these questions. According to some participants in the conference, the meeting will achieve some results on issues such as exchanging information about the movement of troops and military exercises, inviting military observers to inspect sites, and exchanging plans for military activities.

However, the optimistic atmosphere in the conference hall cannot cover the existence of serious differences between the United States and the Soviet Union on many other issues. Although the meeting is almost over the two sides have not stopped blaming each other. According to the state of affairs which has been made public, the two sides still hold different opinions on concrete measures for the issues on which they have reached a compromise in principle. For example, although the Soviet Union agreed with spot inspections, it still insisted that foreign observers must ride in a plane or vehicle provided by the side subject to the inspection, and move within a limited area. The NATO countries are strongly averse to such arrangements. They hold that spot inspections will only play into Soviet hands. As another example, although the United States agreed to inform the Warsaw Pact about the movement of its troops, the

scale of the information offered did not meet the requirements of the Warsaw Pact. As some observers pointed out, the concessions made by the Soviet Union and the United States are very limited, and they are only trying to gain an advantageous position in the European disarmament forum in light of their own strategies.

People believe that it will be a good thing if the European Disarmament Conference in Stockholm finally reaches some agreements, but the agreements cannot cover the existing contention between the United States and the Soviet Union.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4076

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S., WORLD RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV RUDE PRAVO REPLIES

Western Reports Faulted

LD091710 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Sep 86

["Political observer" Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Among the first comments published in connection with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to questions of the RUDE PRAVO newspaper, attention is drawn to the summaries of this important document by certain Western, especially U.S. and West German, news agencies. The most significant thing about these summaries, perhaps, is not what they contain but what they omit. Paradoxical as this may seem, the word moratorium does not appear at all in many of these reports. Yes, indeed, that same moratorium on all nuclear explosions which the Soviet Union has extended for the fourth time and to which most of the RUDE PRAVO questions are devoted.

If one gets one's information only from the reports of some Western agencies, then one could get the impression that there is no such moratorium and never has been. These agencies focus all their attention merely on the problem of a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Without question, this is an important problem. And Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev once again pointed out that we are in favor of holding such a meeting, a meeting that would signify a considerable advance in solving at least one or two vital problems of international security.

But what sort of position is Washington adopting on this issue? Les Aspin, a leading U.S. congressman -- he heads the Armed Services Committee in Congress -- made an apt remark the other day: White House policy in this field is on two different levels: One consists of flowery statements about the need for arms reduction which are never backed up by deeds. The other consists of demands for newer and newer armaments which are always backed up by actions.

Indeed, following the congressman's statement, there were two more actions of this nature: The latest -- the 19th since the Soviet moratorium -- a nuclear explosion in Nevada, and a further U.S. antisatellite weapon testing.

One might ask: Can this be preparation for a new summit meeting? But, if one deliberately proceeds from the standpoint that the moratorium is unacceptable to the U.S. side, if it is blocking the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe, if strategic armaments must be built up -- then what is left on which to reach an agreement? How to

use a summit meeting to reassure the public and deceive people? Such a meeting would scarcely be of benefit.

All this is referred to in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to RUDE PRAVO, just as is the fact that, notwithstanding all the provocations, we are not slamming the door. But, in my opinion, one must point out what are at least the inaccuracies in the summaries of these replies by the Western news agencies which pride themselves so much on their objectivity.

VREMYA Roundup

LD102114 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 10 September in its "Vremya" newscast carries a 9-minute "Studio-20" discussion chaired by Aleksandr Serikov, with correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev reporting from Geneva; Yevgeniy Shirokov from Budapest; Vladimir Kondratyev from Bonn; and Vladimir Dunayev from Washington. The program deals with public reaction to the replies by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to questions from the editor-in-chief of RUDE PRAVO.

Dmitriyev reports that there has been favorable reaction at the Geneva conference on bacteriological weapons. He says the reaction of the socialist and developing countries was extremely positive. An anonymous official from the U.S. State Department said he had not read the answers. Another member of the U.S. delegation, a chemical weapons expert working for the Pentagon, said he had read the answers carefully and described them as "very interesting." Dmitriyev says that if the United States takes concrete action in response, the general process of disarmament will benefit.

Yevgeniy Shirokov reports from Budapest on the Hungarian reaction. He interviews people in the street who say that the USSR is making a serious contribution to the struggle for peace by declaring a moratorium on nuclear tests.

Vladimir Kondratyev reports on reaction in Bonn, where there is great interest, he says. He criticizes the government for saying that a reduction of nuclear arsenals must precede a moratorium. He says that is tantamount to legalizing underground tests, an approach that was exposed in Gorbachev's interview.

Serikov says that in one of the replies to RUDE PRAVO, it was stated that the United States is whipping up artificial optimism about the forthcoming summit, on the one hand, and trying in effect, to substitute talk of a meeting for all the pressing problems involved in curbing the arms race, on the other. He asks Dunayev for examples of this.

Dunayev reports: "Aboard the aircraft on which the U.S. President was returning from his holidays yesterday, his press secretary summoned journalists and told them--I quote--the summit meeting will be productive if the Soviet side wants it to be productive. This was the White House's reaction to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview with RUDE PRAVO.

"Well, you can read what you like into that reaction. Even the Delphi oracle was not so vague! The leading article in THE WASHINGTON POST made a good point: Nuclear tests are like a car's ignition. Switch it off and the engine of the arms race will stop running. But there are people who are very keen to see this engine running, to see it going, working."

"In the same newspaper, Ellen Goodman wrote: Moscow is in favor of halting tests, the U.S. people are in favor of halting tests. It is only the White House that wants them to continue. Well, that is slightly over-simplified because a large number of Americans do not know very much about all this. But, in general, if you ask Americans whether they are for testing or against it, the overwhelming majority will, of course, say that they are against testing. That is how opinions are divided."

"Soviet initiatives have not passed unnoticed. That applies not just to West Europe and progressive circles, so to speak, in America, but to the U.S. people as a whole and even to the U.S. Congress. During the past 12 months the impact has accumulated, so to speak. It has increased. One result of this has been a resolution by the U.S. House of Representatives in which it decided to cut off funds for U.S. nuclear tests, effective from 1 January next year."

11 Sep Talk Show

LD112358 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1820 GMT 11 Sep 86

["The Time for Solutions" program, presented by international affairs writer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, with ZYCIE WARSZAWY journalist Andrzej Bajorek, NEPSZABADSAG journalist Peter Dunai, and Stefan Babiak, Prague Radio correspondent in Moscow, all speaking in Russian; video shows Shishlin and the three participants seated at a table in the studio]

[Text] [Shishlin] Hello, comrades. I want first of all to introduce those taking part in our discussion today. Andrzej represents the Polish newspaper ZYCIE WARSZAWY — Andrzej Bajorek. Peter Dunai represents the Hungarian paper NEPSZABADSAG, and Stefan Babiak works as the representative of Prague radio here in Moscow.

Well, as you will have guessed, the subject we will be talking about today is the recent replies of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to questions from the chief editor of RUDE PRAVO, Zdenek Horeni. Naturally, these replies convey clearly the consistent and principled course of the Soviet State toward overcoming the danger of war and curtailing the arms race. However, one of the arguements resorted to by the oponents of the Soviet moratorium is this: They say, well, a moratorium's all very fine, but what the world is actually facing is a string of highly complex problems which are also awaiting a solution; in partiuclar, there's the problem of reducing strategic armaments, abolition of chemical weapons. A multitude of probelms that could be mentioned. But the moratorium is the first and most indispensable step toward calling a halt. The more so since the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are not in any way turning their backs on the other burning international questions, but are, on the contrary, proposing entirely resonable compromise formulas for settling them.

What stands out in the replies of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is his strict realistic assessment of the actions, not only of those forces that advocate the creation of a radically healtheir international political climate, but also of the opponents of the policy of easing tension, of the policy of reviving the process of detente. This seems to me to be the vitally important problem: Why, when the world is in such danger, when there are all these underwater reefs and rocks seemingly so plainly indicated on the political map of the world, does the United States continue to puruse its routine policy of force? In your opinion, Andrezj, what is the reason for this?

[Bajorek] Of course, it is not enough to say that they don't want disarmament. One has to look at what the dominant motivation are in present U.S. policy; and Mikhail Sergeyevich's interviews gives ansers to these very questions. It clarifies many problems in, I would say, quite simple language. We're all asking ourselves this question: Why does the other side not want to accept disarmament? Why do they want to test new weapons, instead of stopping? And I think that in the light of the interview and in the light of what we can observe every day when we read the papers and listen to the commentaries of the political commentators, it's obvious that they want to arm us for death [as heard] They...

[Shishlin, interrupting, corrects Bajorek's Russian] Arm to death.

[Bajorek] ...to death. Strange as it may seem, they don't want us to be disarmed and in some sense, you might say, weaker; on the contrary, they want us to arm ourselves to the point where we have no possibilicy of doing anything other than that.

[Shishlin] Yes, I think possibily I'd agree with that. That's pretty much what they're aiming for -- to exhaust the socialist countries morally and give them no chance to get on with their constructive tasks. What do you think, Peter?

[Dunai] I have the impression that the United States wants us to choose the path that they have already chosen. By that I mean militarization of the economy. That's what will happen in the United States. Now we can see how they [pauses] as far as influence is concerned, in political and military circles, is growing. [as heard] And my meaning is this; if they wanted to compete with us peacefully, perhaps they would not win. I mean, for example, that the profits of those vast militarist enterprises such as Boeing or MacDonald Douglas are thousands per cent. There was that scandal recently -- 1 or 2 years ago, when the U.S. Congress -- the accountants carried out a check, and discovered that, in one swindle, the contractors had added to their bill, say $500, or $600 [figures as heard] -- that's a huge amount of money.

[Shishlin] Yes, but besides swindles, they also unfortunately do more serious things, and for those things a still higher price has to be paid. The bill runs, of course, to hundreds of billions of dollars, and the present administration has spent, during its term in office, something like a trillion dollars on the arms race. [Bajorek] Yes, they have the money and they hope we haven't, or not enough; that if we arm ourselves, we'll have no money for other expenditure.

[Babiak] I think a very important point in the U.S. calculation is that the Americans are, after all, trying to achieve military superiority; and I consider that the main motive among all those that at present determine U.S. policy, even though it's common knowledge that these U.S. actions have very dangerous consequences for the world community. They make for feverish international relations. They remove the limitations fixed by a treaty -- take off the brakes -- in the sphere of the arms race. They exacerbate the global problems that now agitate the whole world. I think

the U.S. does not want -- not that it can not, it simply does not want -- to understand the very simple logic that the more arms there are, the more distrust; and the more distrust there is, the more probable it becomes that all these armaments will be used, and there will be a great disaster from which there will be no escape. This reminds me of an interesting thought that was expressed back in the 18th century by British publicist and philospher Edmund Burke. He said that great powers and weak minds were imcompatible; and his words take on a special significance in our time, when not only the fate of kingdoms and states but the destiny of the entire human race depends upon the intellect and sense of respoinsibility of statesmen.

[Bajorek] Yes, but I would like to add something: I agree with what you say, but I should like to make the point that this involves not just the great powers. It involves all states, peoples and societies. For instance, we represent the European countries here. We must say that this course toward the arms race is not just aimed at getting the Soviet Union to arm itself: they intend that we -- Poland, and your country [CSSR] and Hungary -- should also arm ourselves proportionately. They know, moreover, that we have certain economic difficulties, and they are applying all the more pressure now, no doubt because they sense that we shall surmount these difficulties with time and we will find things easier.

[Shishlin] You know, we cannot say, by and large, that we have been particularly lucky when it comes to U.S. presidents and administrations. But all the same I was just thinking that in the seventies we did manage to conclude the interim 1972 agreement on the limitation of strategic armaments. We also managed to agree on SALT II, although the treaty failed to be ratified by the U.S. Senate. The ABM Treaty of indefinite validity was concluded. There were agreements of some kind. But just look at the foreign policy luggage of the present U.S. Administration. As we've already said here, we find just-destroyed agreements, and the present administration has not managed to work out a single sensible and serious agreement on the key problems of international security, either with us or with any other country. It seems to me in this context that, of course, problems do arise. And it is with good reason that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU central Committee, refers in his replies [as heard] to the question of what attitude to adopt to the present administration, and rejects the viewpoint that one cannot get on with this administration, and that one can wait 2 and 1/2 years, a new administration will come to power and everything will be alright.

[Bajorek] Naturally, what you don't do today you won't make up for tomorrow.

[Shishlin] Yes, and this is all the more so in that the nuclear age is indeed, as has been said rather dramatically, a short-lived one. But let us just hope that the nuclear age will be followed by a nuclear-free future. And in this regard I think, Andrzej, that it is very correct to say that the problem of the arms race, the surmounting of the arms race, really does involve all countries, irrespective of the size of these countries and irrespective of the location of these countries, whether it be Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America. In other words, these are truly international problems, and from this point of view it seems to me to be worth paying attention to the question of what role other states can play here in solving these problems which are on the agenda when it comes to Soviet-U.S. relations, and on the agenda of world politics.

[Bajorek] It seems to me that this role is a very considerable one. Although we do not play a direct part in negotiations, by shaping our policies in a particular direction we support one tendency and oppose another. From Poland's point of view,

peace is very important. We lost so much in the last world war. As you well know, Poland lost 6 million people. In proportion to the whole population, this is an enormous figure.

[Shishlin] Yes, it is simply a monstrous figure.

[Bajorek] Now there are other problems. We now have to consider the longer term. And I would say that we feel instinctively that we Poles greatly need cooperation, an atmosphere of peace, a good atmosphere in Europe. There is no need for me to mention that in certain military plans of the generals on the other side of the Atlantic that the Vistula is the place to draw the line. They believe that some imaginary Westward campaign by Soviet troops must be halted somewhere along the Vistula. It must be said that the word halt sounds...

[Shishlin interrupts] Almost innocent!

[Bajorek] ...It doesn't sound so bad. What it really means is the destruction of 37 million Poles making this land a desert, perhaps forever.

[Dunai] If I may, I should like to express the following thought: Europe is very small in the geographical sense. A news conference was held in Moscow recently, at which Comrade Falin said that it is now 6 minutes to 12. What does this mean in practice. It means that if you take, for instance, the territory of the FRG — they have Pershings, Pershing II's — for the Pershing II's there are just 6 minutes, 6,7, or 8 minutes from launch to target, in another part of Europe. This is a terribly short space. We are literally sitting on a bomb here in Europe. That is why we have to...

[Shishlin interrupts] If anyone is sitting on a bomb it is West Germany, where there are 5,000 nuclear warheads.

[Dunai] Yes, quite so. And we have other problems, common problems. Take water. If the water is polluted in the FRG or Austria, we will be affected, and so will Romania, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union. It also works the other way round. This means that the customs officials, the border guards cannot stop the polluted water, or...

[Shishlin interrupts] Or polluted air.

[Dunai] ... or polluted air. And we have one common European value above all: security. We need security more than, for instance, other parts of the world, because so much is located in such close proximity here.

[Shishlin] Yes, and things are too fragile; everything is crowded, everything is near to everything else.

[Babiak] But this does not just apply to Europe.

[Shishin] of course not.

[Babiak] We are saying that this has a direct bearing on us. This goes without saying. This problem is fraught with much danger. But this problem of war and peace, as embodied in the question of halting nuclear tests, is a subject discussed throughout the world. For instance, the Nonaligned Movement conference ended in Harare, the Zimbabwean capital, just the other day. The conference began with the moratorium issue, and the issue is also touched on in the final documents. The appeal to Mikhail

Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan which was adopted by the conference participants, says precisely that the arms race must be halted because the danger of mankind's self-destruction is greater than ever before. The call for a moratorium and the call for a resolution of these problems were made with good reason, although the developing countries have a very large number of other problems which they need to tackle urgently.

There is another aspect: the recent actions of the Delhi Six. They consist not just of appeals, but concrete measures to try to achieve a ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible. The meeting of experts of the Delhi Six, the Soviet Union and the United States on the issue of the monitoring a ban on nuclear blasts is a concrete example of action, since the group of six is becoming an authoritative arbiter in the controversy about whether nuclear tests can be halted and monitored, something about which, if I am not mistaken, only Washington today has doubts.

[Shishlin] Yes, and you no doubt also noticed, Stefan, that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies contain a serious new idea on monitoring: the creation of an international, supranational system.

[Babiak] Yes, and the Delhi Six are in fact proposing a concrete framework for implementing their own possibilities and the possibilities existing today in other countries throughout the world to monitor seriously everything that may affect the observance of a ban, or a treaty or agreement banning nuclear tests. So I think that it really is a worldwide problem, and if you consider the reactions that have appeared throughout the world to the extension of the Soviet moratorium from 6 August to the end of this year, or rather to 1 January of next year, then I would not hesitate to call this a world plebiscite on the question whose results are self-evident.

[Shishlin] Yes, I think that a new thinking is, albeit with difficulty, overcoming the force of inertia and making headway in international affairs, particularly. As we all of course know very well, the moratorium is the first and very important step, although the agenda of world politics includes other problems, too.

[Bajorek] It is, so to speak, the key, because everything starts with it, and it provides the possibility for solving all the other problems. If we do not create new weapons, then the weapons that we have now will, of course, become outdated, just as old aircraft or old tanks do. Then we will have the possibility, the conditions, for saying farewell to those weapons altogether.

[Shishlin] Of course, and what is sometimes unfortunately forgotten -- I say unfortunately because certain political circles in the West actually make a point of forgetting it -- is that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in no way limit themselve to the sole idea of banning nuclear tests and nothing more. We want to go further, to cover strategic weapons, medium-range weapons, and conventional weapons. So in this sea of problems that the world today is up against their really is one key one: that of stopping the arms race, and then going into reverse. Listening as I did, carefully, to what you have been saying, one can see yet again that whatever problem you take, be it environmental protection, energy, or aid to undeveloped countries, it all hinges on overcoming the arms race, because it is not just a waste; it is a dangerous waste, which really may lead to the nuclear abyss.

[Bajorek] And it creates the climate, too: It is impossible to solve the supplementary questions if this question number one is not going to be solved and is going to be put aside.

[Shishlin] Yes, and you know I would like to turn to our viewers and draw their attention to something that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his replies to the chief editor of RUDE PRAVO. It concerns the socialist countries, and this is what Mikhail Sergeyevich wrote: I should like to stress in particular that we value very highly and scrupulously take into account the opinions of our allies. We are fully resolved to continue to improve the mechanism and methods of consulation and jointly draw up the foreign policy of socialism. We place a high value on the political initiatives of our allies and friends, their vigor in the struggle for a new political thinking, and their active and equal participation in the common efforts to solve problems of peace, security and disarmament.

I think that if you look at the facts, then 1986 is a uniquely remarkable year for the foreign policy activity of the socialist countries, and in this respect Poland is in one of the front lines I think. Is this so, Andrzej?

[Bajorek] Poland is now becoming more active with regard to its foreign policy. After the events in the early 1980's, with which we are all familiar, it was not so active as it had been during the postwar decades, but the Polish Government has been able to overcome the attempts to isolate Poland on the international scene, and Poland, as a meeting place for various political leaders and politicians, is once again playing a role. Of course the chief direction for us is to strengthen our links with the fraternal socialist countries. Of this there can be no doubt, because in both ideology and economics this is our chief platform of action. But at the same time we are trying to improve relations with the West European countries.

As you know, Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski intends soon to go to China, and the world situation will probably be a subject of his talks in Beijing. China, you know, is also a nuclear country, and China's joining this course of disarmament could play a very great role. So Poland is trying to take a more active part in all the processes which further peace and cooperation among all countries, regardless of their social systems.

[Shishlin] Hungary, too, has traditionally always had very developed links, particulrly through its economy, but also through its political style, has it not?

[Dunai] This year, as I think you will agree, we had an event of the very greatest importance: the Warsaw Pact conference and the call from Budapest for disarmament in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Aside from that we have concentrated this year on Europe. For example, our premier visited the GDR in September, then Australia...

[Shishlin interrupts]...Where, incidentally, there will soon be a big meeting as part of the pan-European process.

[Dunai] Yes, in Vienna, and we are working very actively to ensure that this meeting will be a success. We have also held many international conferences. In July, for example, we had a meeting of scientists against nuclear weapons, a very important international forum.

[Babiak] Your quotation from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview for RUDE PRAVO show not only the line that should develop in our countries' policy, but also the trend that exists today -- that of intensifying international efforts by the socialist countries, not only efforts to coordinate our peace advance, but also as part of our defense alliance and economic community.

But there is one thing to which I would like to draw attention -- something very

important that contains a certain reserve, so to speak, of progressive and useful political forces and progressive political potential. This our countries' cooperation with the developing and liberated countries. Until now they have primarily shown concern for solving their internal problems and making ends meet, so to speak. Recently, however, they have begun to come out onto the world scene very actively, saying widely and in a well-argued way that they, too, have interests and that they also are affected by issues of war and peace -- which is quite right. I think that the development of bilateral relations between the socialist countries and the developing countries will ensure that this untappped political potential for progressive development in strengthening peace and preventing the threat of war will be used more effecively than hitherto.

[Shishlin] In winding up our conversation I would say we have seen thoughout 1986 convinces us that the potential for peace really is growing, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is quite right in his conclusion in his replies to chief editor of RUDE PRAVO that we have entered, or are entering, the second phase of a global antinuclear process when all the ideas are on the table, and the time has come for action. I should like to say good-bye to our viewers and to thank you for taking part of our conversation. Good-bye!

U.S. 'Silence, Spy Mania'

LD132319 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 13 Sep 86

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yevgeniy Grachev]

[Excerpts] Hello Comrades. The past week in international life has been punctuated by a wide discussion of the major Soviet peace initiatives put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union has made a new important step toward curbing the arms race; it is now up to the United States. But is there any kind of shift in the position of the White House with regard to the major Soviet initiative? How are the replies of the Soviet leader to the questions of the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO being assessed in the United States? Listen to the report of our correspondent in New York, Vladimir Zvyagin.

[Zvyagin] The reaction in the United States to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to RUDE PRAVO can be presented 2-fold. On the one hand the official propaganda; the national mass media is striving to keep silent about the new appeal from the USSR for a sensible, constructive policy in the sphere of disarmament based on the new realities of the nuclear age. References to Comrade Gorbachev's speech have appeared in the reports of news agencies, in certain major newspapers such as THE WASHINGTON POST or THE NEW YORK TIMES, and in television commentaries. But without doubt, this is not commensurate with the scale and depth of the Soviet proposals. Everyone I have spoken with about this over the past few days admits it.

At the same time a hysterical spy-mania campaign is being stirred up by certain circles in the country. Sometimes one is dumbfounded at how crudely and clumsily U.S. propaganda operated, how primitive the set of stock phrases and tricks used by it is. But the paradox is that these cliches are working in a whole number of cases, and the campaign of lies and juggling with facts orchestrated by whoever's invisible hand it is, is reaping results. The reasons for this extreme annoyance of a whole number of

exceptionally influential figures in the U.S. leadership, including those in the entourage of the President himself, concerning the nature of Soviet foreign policy on the offensive, particularly in recent months. They feel they really ought to respond, but there is as yet nothing to respond with except general discussions about devotion to peace. Hence the accusations of propaganda against the Soviet Union and new objections concerning the monitoring system, work on which they say has not been finished, and so on and so forth.

PRAVDA Weekly Review

PM150929 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Peresada "International Review"]

[Excerpt]Yet another week of 1986, the 37th, has passed. It was crammed with the most diverse events in international life. Some of them have flashed into the past, like a moth which lives for only 1 day. By contrast, others are plowing a deep furrow in world politics.

The key disarmament problems raised in M.S. Gorbachev's 18 August statement, and first and foremost the question of the moratorium on nuclear explosions, remain at the center of international debate. This debate received a strong additional impetus from the Soviet leader's interview to the newspaper RUDE PRAVO. It gave answers to not only the Czechoslovak newspaper but essentially all mankind, which is profoundly alarmed that the moratorium introduced and already extended four times by the Soviet Union to this day remains unilateral.

There is still time for the United States to finally join the moratorium, but it is becoming shorter and shorter. The countdown is in progress. And not only the future of relations between the two great powers depends to a great extent on whether the moratorium becomes a joint one in the remaining 15 weeks or, possibly, proves to be the last Soviet decision of this kind. The prospects for the development of the international situation as a whole also depend on it.

A Unique Chance

Th answers to RUDE PRAVO immediately found themselves at the center of world public attention. When you read the reports you can see that irrespective of the differnces in the social systems in the countries from which the reactions come and no matter how the people expressing their views may be different and sometimes implacable in their political views, the teletype tapes are dominated by a single thought: The Soviet moratorium provides a unique chance for emerging from the savage nuclear confrontation and easing international tension.

The Soviet arguments have made a great impression in the world. They convincingly rebuff the claims spread in the West that the Soviet Union's latest extension of the moratorium is a propaganda gesture. The total untenability of the United States' "antimoratorium" arguments has been exposed. The USSR is advocating real progress in curbing the arms race, the Japanese newspaper ASAHI notes. The attitude displayed toward nuclear explosions is today the touchstone by which the real thrust of any nuclear state's foreign policy is gauged, France's L'HUMANITE writes. The Soviet leader showed totally plainly who is afraid of the moratorium and why and who is not

interested in banning tests of nuclear weapons, the Polish newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU comments.

These "who's" and "why's" apply wholly to the Washington administration. Increasing numbers of people in the world (and indeed in the United States, too) realize that what lies behind its refusal to join the moratorium is the United States' aspiration to achieve military supriority and continue the arms race by creating [sodzavaya] more sophisticated types of weapons and extending this race to new spheres, particularly outer space. [paragraph continues]

Does this not conceal an intention to continue to rely on force in solving international problems, to dictate its own will to sovereign states, and to stifle liberation movements. Another reason the moratorium is evidently unacceptable to the Washington leaders is their fear of honest competition with the other social system in the sphere of the economy, democracy, and culture. The nuclear explosions are continuing because they are not concerned about what happens to nature or the human habitat and because the profits of the manufacturers of death are more important to them than the views and vital interests of hundreds of millions of people.

As is known, Washington has already tried a multitude of tricks to avoid meeting the Soviet moratorium proposal half-way. Conjecture about the impossibility of monitoring [kontrol] the holding of tests, claims that explosions are important not so much for developing nuclear weapons qualitatively as for verifying the combat capability of existing nuclear charges, statements about a threat to U.S. security, and so forth have been put into circulation.

Recently officials in the United States and American propaganda have been gambling on the following thesis: It is not test explosions but nuclear weapons which are terrifying, they say, and therefore it is not a moratorium but the reduction of nuclear arsenals which should be discussed. An attempt is thereby being made to artificially subdivide the problem, counterpose the moratorium to arms reductions, and depict it as unimportant and even as a measure obstructing the disarmament process. Here it is deliberately "forgotten" that back in January the USSR proposed a joint start on "eradicating the evil itself" — eliminating all nuclear weapons by the end of the century.

And attention has been drawn to this throughout the world. "The Soviet Union's position is that the ending of nuclear explosions is organically linked with reducing nuclear weapons and would make a very substantial contribution to curbing the arms race," the XINHUA agency (PRC) notes. News agencies, statesmen, and the press of many countries are pointing in their comments to the exposure of the United States' attempts to distort our position and "justify" its obstructionism.

The following is also characteristic. Although the reactions differ in spirit or tone and some are characterized by "enforced caution," in the words of Radio France-Inter, in them you can either hear a very forceful demand or detect in one way or another a desire that the United States should follow the Soviet Union's example and stop nuclear explosions and respond positively to the Soviet appeal to reach an agreement on ending nuclear tests.

What was the reaction to the Soviet leader's interview in the United States itself? How were the American people informed of it? For everything that has been said cannot fail to concern Americans both by virtue of the essence of the matter and also because the Soviet leader's words are addressed not least to precisely the United States.

U.S. newspapers and television companies are no longer capable of hushing up news from Moscow or news flashes which go around the world. However many news reports, not to mention commentaries, deliberately filter out the criticism of Washington's obstructionist policy and "drop" those arguments in the answers which discuss the fundamental significance of the moratorium and analyze the danger of the consequences of the nuclear and space arms race being fueled across the ocean. This is not just a sample of the vaunted "objectivity" of the American press, which manifestly operates on instructions from above. [paragraph continues]

It is evidence of the political impotence of the U.S. Administration, which has nothing to defend itself with and can only hide the truth from the people while at the same time serving up something else to distract the public's attention from the main topic of the day.

To this end, first, anti-Soviet propaganda clamors like the "Daniloff affair" are organized and then something else "a bit more subtle" is dreamed up. Aboard the aircraft in which the U.S. President was returning to Washington from vacation his press secretary told the journalists on board, who inquired about how the White House sees the productiveness of a possible summit: "There will be a productive meeting [vstrecha budet produktivnoy] if the Soviet side wants it to be productive."

How is a statement of this kind to be interpreted? As meaning that everything is allegedly ready for a meeting on the American side, that the problem lies in the Soviet position, and thus that there are demands to which Moscow must response [s Moskvy i spros], "the ball is in its court." Yet the situation is completely different. Despite all the USSR's efforts, since the Geneva meeting the sides have not moved an inch closer to a agreement on reducing arms.

Our country has put forward a program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the banning of chemical weapons, the elimination of medium-range arms in Europe, a radical reduction in the numerical strength of armed forces, and so forth. For more than a year now we have not been carrying out nuclear explosions. But to all this Washington says "no." And how is it acting?

The latest nuclear explosion in Nevada — the 20th since the Soviet moratorium was announced — took place 11 September. And according to the American Peace Test antiwar organization the Pentagon also has a further, simply provocative [vyzyvayushchiy] program for conducting explosions. It is planned to carry out another one in September and three in October, and in December it is planned to carry out a nuclear explosion which reportedly "will be exactly the same" as the April "mighty oak" test, which was accompanied by a severe leak of radiation inside the underground test complex in Nevada.

But Washington is not only engaged in sabotaging the moratorium. The SDI program is being expedited, and other steps undermining the ABM Treaty are being taken. The abandonment [vykhod iz] of the SALT II treaty has been announced. Military maneuvers unprecedented since the fifties have been initiated in the vicinity of the Soviet Union — from the North Sea and the Baltic to the Far East.

So what is the end result? Mankaind is in favor of ending nuclear tests and disarmament, and only the U.S. ruling circles are against. One against the whole world! What we are witnessing is an insane addiction to force, dangerous self-intoxication which is fraught with an explosion. Is even a little thought given there to the act that they have a people of their own who (around 80 percent of the

population, according to the polls) would like an end to the nuclear explosions in Nevada, as, incidentally, throughout the world. Of course, the United States has its own interpretation of the concept of "democracy." But if the general human concept of "democracy" means "the people's power," what kind of "democracy" is it when not the slightest attention is paid to the people's opinion.

It is obvious that an acute and intensive struggle for real movement in curbing the arms race lies ahead. [paragraph continues]

We believe that sensible Americans, together with all those in the world to whom peace is precious, will make the maximum possible contribution to this struggle. It is to be hoped that those who are responsible for the fate of America will also finally come round to heeding the realities of the age, to a new political thinking. It will be saddening if this year the U.S. Administration again disregards the really unique chance which the Soviet moratorium provides for taking a step toward eliminating the nuclear threat. The negative consequences of such a course of events for peace on earth would soon make themselves felt.

14 Sep Talk Show

LD150940 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 14 Sep 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program presented by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the ZA RUBEZHOM editorial board, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of KOMMUNIST]

[Text] [Nekrasov] I belive that the main subject of our talk today is what the whole world is talking about — namely, the replies by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary to the questions by Comrade Zdenek Horeni, editor-in-chief of the Czechoslovak Communist newspaper RUDE PRAVO. I believe I should start with the obvious fact that this new and most important USSR foreign policy document is linked in the most direct way with the fundamental propositions contained in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement on Soviet television on 18 August. As you will recall, that statement not only dealt with the extension of our moratorium, but also gave a new and broad exposition to the principles of the CPSU and the Soviet state's foreign policy activity in the contemporary world conditions. It was a sort of exposition of the fundamental propositions and conclusions of the 27th CPSU Congress with reference to the international conditions in the world at the present time.

These latest replies provide an explanation of many of the propositions in that statement. They provide answers to the questions being asked abroad regarding the 18 August statement, both to the sincere questions, so to speak, which are asked when our position has not been fully understood, and to the mendacious and sometimes blatantly slanderous attacks by militarist propaganda against our foreign policy. Therefore, these replies must, I repeat, be evaluated in close connection with the fundamental propositions of the 18 August statement. At the same time, I also would link them to another event — the 41st UN General Assembly session which opens the day after tomorrow, on 16 September. Undoubtedly the issues raised in our recent foreign policy acts — particularly those connected with ending the nuclear arms race, which first of all means in practical terms ending nuclear weapons tests — will be at the focus of

attention from the first day of the session of the world forum of states which the annual general assembly meeting represents. Also as you know, there will be meetings between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. During the session in New York those meetings, as you will remember, aim at solving the question of whether the new Soviet-U.S. summit will take place. In this connection, the replies to RUDE PRAVO are of great interest to world public opinion and are of very great practical importance as a new and vivid manifestation of reason and good sense in the current extremely complex and dangerous period in international relations. Overall, I believe that stress should be laid, in connection with everything I have said, on a thought Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed in his replies: I believe that we already have entered the second stage of the global antinuclear procress, the phase not only of hopes but of realistic plans and specific actions based upon them.

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you mentioned one of the most important features of our foreign policy in recent times: It is not simply a matter of raising the question of the need for a new political thinking, but, I would say, action based on a new political thinking. This action, although unfortunately of a unilateral nature thus far, has the infectious force of example, and this undoubtedly is very important in the conditions that have now taken shape.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted, the most valuable thing we still have left is the time to make joint and responsible, albeit compromise, decisions. Time, however, is passing rapidly, and this is why practical action is so necessary now.

[Nekrasov] Yes, time is passing, but the U.S. side's sabotage of fruitful talks unfortunately continues. I do not believe "sabotage" is too strong a word today to describe the U.S. position at the Geneva talks, for we have not moved forward one inch to an arms reduction agreement since last November's, Geneva summit, and this despite all the Soviet Union's efforts, with which we are all familiar. That is why the mutual cessation of nuclear explosions would be so important now. But I believe there is a quite concrete and clear understanding in the world today about this, an understanding that ending tests will essentially halt the race in the most dangerous sphere -- that of creating a real possibility, having halted the arms race in qualitative terms, for dealing with it in quantitative terms. This, the Soviet Union rightly points out, will be much simpler. The overwhelming majority of mankind supports this viewpoint today. This is shown by the message from the leaders of the so-called Delhi Six to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan. The same thing was shown by the Harare appeal adopted by the 18th Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries. The same position is held by major and influential political parties in the West, including the social democrats in West Germany and the British Labor Party. It is virtually the overwhelming majority of mankind, including the Amerians. Our press, as you will remember, has on numerous occasions quoted the figure that 80 percent of Americans who now vote vote for ending nuclear tests. And who is against? Their opponents can be named, and counted almost on the fingers of one hand: specifically, official Washington circles, officials in London and Bonn closely connected with them, and the pro-NATO press which essentially is funded by the military industrial complex.

The circles I have named, including many bourgeois mass media and reactionary observers and commentators, are continuing to try to confuse world public opinion, putting forward various arguments about alleged obstacles to agreement on a total end to nuclear tests. That is why I see such great importance in the exposure of those false

arguments which was provided in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies. It was a detailed and convincing exposure based on facts, showing and, to use a phrase, developing like a camera film, the whole essence of the speculation and machinations behind the views on the impossibility of other countries joining the moratorium. Naturally, in this connection I would like to mention factors preventing the achievements, or rather the consolidation of trust, such as the new anti-Soviet campaign being whipped up now in the United States over the facts revealed about a U.S. correspondent's espionage in the Soviet Union, the planned entry by U.S. ships into the Sea of Okhostk following the current maneuvers in the area of the Japanese islands, and so forth. Therefore, I would like to mention this important point in the replies: that particular responsibility for the course of events and, it may be said, for mankind's future, lies with two great powers -- us and the United States. Hence our position, the one clearly stated in the replies: No matter how we are provoked, we will not break off the threads of contact with the U.S. Administration, nor will we slam the door, although certain people in the West, particularly in the White House entourage, would very much like us to. This Soviet position produces a very great impression on world public opinion.

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you have now come to a question which, I believe, will be of interest to our listeners. How would you sum up the impression that this new Soviet foreign policy act has made on the world? What can be said about his to date?

[Nekrasov] Well, first of all, I want to make the reservation that I will talk about the responses from the other camp, as it were, since the position of our camp -- by which I mean the fraternal socialist community -- is perfectly clear. Our allies and friends understand our position well and support it consistently and firmly. For our part, as Comrade Gorbachev has observed, we very much value and scrupulously take into account the opinion of our allies. We value highly their activities in the struggle for new political thinking, as well as their active and equal participation in the common efforts to resolve the problems of peace, security, and disarmament.

[Andrianov] It seems to me that, in this connection, much is revealed by even the fact that, in order to elucidate the position of our party and state, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee preferred the pages of a publication of the fraternal Communist Party of Czecholsovakia, the newspaper RUDE PRAVO; that is, a newspaper of one of the states of our community, which is welded together by the indestructible ties of fraternal friendship.

[Nekrasov] Well, if we're talking about the world as a whole, I think one can repeat the words from Mikhail Sergeyebich Gorbachev's replies: The attitude toward nuclear explosions is a test of historical maturity. What is more, it is the touchstone that puts to the test the real purposefulness and main substance of the foreign policy of each nuclear state. Well, that can be said of the responses and reaction of world opinion as of today, that is, literally a few days after publication of the replies?

Like our statement of 18 August, these replies have evoked the most widespread response. This is, undoubtedly, to be explained by the scale of the Soviet Union's new peace-loving initiatives, their exceptional topicality and the account that they take of the demands of the historical period, and the frame of mind and aspirations of the broadest strata of the public. I think it can be formulated in this way -- the general reaction in the world: Moscow has made a vital contribution to the cause of restraining the nuclear arms race and halting the military escalation between East and West.

[Volskiy] I think, Vadim Nikolayevich that it is no exaggeration to say that, in general, the Soviet initiatives to strengthen international security and, primarily now, our moratorium — to a considerable extent, it is precisely this that is determining the political atmosphere in the world. It doesn't always happen directly, perhaps, not necessarily instantly, but it is noticeable virtually everywhere, in all capitals, even in Washington, where, as we've been saying today, the administration is having to react somehow to our initiatives or seek excuses for rejecting them. And at times, I would say, it is having to artificially create such excuses, as you were saying about the actions of the Pentagon. Certainly, the Pentagon and military circles have a clear line in this sense: a glimmer of hope of relaxing international tension has only to spring up — and the mechanism for the deliberate exacerbation of tension switches itself on almost automatically.

[Andrianov] That is all true. Indeed, when Vadim Nikolayevich was speaking about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies, he touched in passing upon a provocation about which I want to speak in great detail. This was, what I should call, the provocative militarist demonstration that Washington has staged this week in the immediate vicinity of the shores of the Soviet Far East. I have in mind the U.S. naval maneuvers that began 4 days ago in the Sea Of Japan. Incidentally, they are some of the largest maneuvers in recent times. They involved a score of warships, including the strike-aircraftcarriers Ranger and Carl Vinson, which the U.S. and Japanese press say are carrying nuclear weapons. Taking part for the first time in these maneuvers is a recently created formation of the U.S. 7th Fleet. It is the Romeo battleship combat group led by the battleship New Jersey. This formation's distinctive feature is that it is armed with a total of 70 Tomahawk missile launchers. These first-strike weapons can be armed with nuclear warheads. On the subject of these naval maneuvers THE WASHINGTON TIMES has said that never before have so many U.S. ships been concentrated in this area. Citing an official Pentagon spokesman, the newspaper noted that during the exercises the U.S. Navy was to demonstrate its ability to blockade the Tsushima and Tsugaru straits -- that is, the international passages from the Sea of Japan into the Pacific Ocean. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI noted that these manuevers are the first trial of the news U.S. naval strategy, which was recently announced by John Lehman, U.S. secretary for the Navy. He stated that the Pentagon had decided not to limit itself to just the Atlantic theater and now intended in addition to display its muscles in the northern part of the Pacific Ocean. The Japanese press has no doubt as to the provocative nature of this military display, for instance. In particular ASAHI says that during the maneuvers a nuclear strike on the Far East will be simulated. In the course of this game, if it can be so called, the U.S. cruise missile launchers will operate under the cover of aircraft based in Japan and the navy of Washington's ally in the Far East. The U.S. press has reported that from the Sea of Japan, as you, Vadim Nikolayevich, have already said, the U.S. naval squadron wil proceed into the Sea of Okhotsk. In this connection how can one not fail to remember what a rumpus Washington propaganda has been kicking up regarding the mythical Soviet threat in Central America? At the same time no Soviet ships are sailing along U.S. shores, but U.S. warships are getting closer and closer to the Soviet Union's seaboard, not only in Europe but also in Asia.

These obvious facts are by no means evidence of peace-loving attitudes on the part of certain circles across the ocean.

[Volskiy] One might recall in this connection, Boris Vasilyevich, that several months ago, precisely around the time of the first U.S. aggression against Libya this spring, two U.S. ships did indeed pass from the Mediterranean into the Black Sea, approaching the immediate vicinity of the Crimean shores.

[Nekrasov] Yes, up to the shores of the Crimea.

[Andrianov] That is quite true. Returning to the questions that were put to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee by RUDE PRAVO's editor in chief, I should like to note that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev touched upon a very broad range of pressing problems. They also included economic problems, though, true, they were mentioned in connection with the plans of certain circles in the West, above all of course in the United States, to continue their course of an unbridled arms race in order to undermine economically the positions of world socialism. Let us say directly that this is no shiningly new venture. How many times already have the imperialist gentlemen attempted to do this! And nothing has come of it for them, and never will! But they have done quite some harm to themselves!

Let us take, for example, the U.S. economy. In 1984 and 1985 it went through its most profound and protracted crisis for a little over 50 years, and since then it has been unable to enter a period of upswing. For almost a year the U.S. economy has been marking time, as it were. Moreover, specialists in the United States itself believe that the U.S. economy is teetering on the brink of a new crisis. After all, the White House has to all intents and purposes placed the economy's civilian sectors on starvation rations, since the main national resources are at the disposal of the military-industrial complex. In this connection the authoritative magazine FOREIGN POLICY has remarked that the priority that is now plainly being given to arms production is leading to a dangerous destabilization of the country's economy and to the undermining of key nonmilitary industries such as metallurgy, the auto industry and heavy engineering.

For example, here are some figures cited by the very well-informed NEW YORK TIMES: Over the past 4 years the eight leading metallurgical companies in the United States have suffered some $8 billion in losses. More than 300,000 metallurgical workers have been made redundant. U.S. economists are also drawing a joyless picture of other civilian sectors of the economy, which under existing conditions are unable to compete effectively in world markets with their rivals from other countries. The foreign trade deficit is therefore mounting. Specialists estimate that by the end of this year the trade deficit will be $190 billion; that is to say that last year's record in this field will be surpassed. In the unanimous view of authoritative experts the sorry state of affairs in the U.S. economy leaves no hopes of solving chronic socioeconomic problems in the United States such as unemployment, poverty, malnutrition, and homelessness. Even the bourgeois press has been forced to admit this. After all, there are over 35 million poverty-stricken people in the capitalist world's richest country. Over 3 million Americans do not have a roof over their heads in the most direct sense of the world. Harvard University research has shown that at present 20 million U.S. citizens are regularly undernourished. Even according to official estimates, the country's army of unemployed is keeping firmly at the 8 million mark, although according to trade-union figures there are 6 million more.

Senator William Proxmire has said that the stumbling U.S. economy simply does not have the resources left for growth, and its future, he emphasized, looks truly frightening. This is all the pay-off for the militarist course of the present Washington administration, which is continuing the arms race.

[Volskiy] Here we reach the end of our broadcast. Thank you for your attention. Until we meet again!

Broadcast to North America

LD152333 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Sep 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Pozner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. This is Vladimir Pozner presenting "Top Priority." With me on the panel, as usual, are Drs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov. The theme for today I think is obvious. Let's look at the answers that the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, gave to the Czech newspaper RUDE PRAVO. I would like to begin with perhaps a somewhat cynical statement, but it's a cynical statement that we've been hearing in the West, which is upon looking at these answers, I repeat, the reaction is: So what else is new! Deja vu, it's all been said. This kind of dismissing it, kind as if it weren't really all that important. I'd like you to begin at least by examining that approach and what those answers really mean.

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, my first impression is that there is a kind of blackout in American mass media about that interview. [passage omitted]

[Bogdanov] My difficulty is what to do with our listeners and how to deal with that interview in that case when American mass media didn't pay attention to that very important thing. Should we tell our listeners over there about what it's all about or we should just comment? [passage indistinct]

[Pozner] Obviously what I would ask you gentlemen to do is to point out the salient features of the interview so as to make it clear why we consider it to be important. Perhaps you would do that, or begin, Dr Plekhanov? [passage omitted: Plekhanov says a most important point was to outline the meaning of the Soviet moratorium in face of continuing U.S. tests, response to Soviet moratorium confirms that the USSR is right; Pozner sums up by referring to the importance of the moratorium and asks what other point can be brought up]

[Bogdanov] The other point of importance to my mind is that the (?policy) of response to that moratorium is just to signal to us how the other side is serious about nuclear disarmament, because, why, they're insisting on moratoria. Not only because the substance of it is very important because it's a most simple, you know, step in bringing all [words indistinct] with disarmament, creating a proper environment, political environment, mutual trust, if you like. In the environment of mutual trust you can go ahead quicker than you are doing now. That is what moratorium is meant, number two.

Then, you know, I would like to call the attention of our listeners to one very important point of that interview, to rather a question that the secretary general put in his interview, the secretary general of the Communist Party. He put it very bluntly, and very, you know, frankly. What it's all about, why USA does not reciprocate us in that very important (?problem). Are they preparing for nuclear war? If it is so, (?then it's), the behavior of this administration is very logical. They're just getting ready for a new war, they're modernizing their nuclear weapons, they're building new and new warheads more acurate and with the bigger (?toll weight). Then their policy is quite clear and we need an answer to that.

Then I would like to call our listeners' attention to another very important point. That interview is made before meeting, before a meeting between two foreign ministers which is to take place on the 18th and 19th of September, and the importance of this meeting is that discussion at that meeting should signal to us if there is any ground, if there is any grounds for the summit meeting that people are talking about very very much, and it is again, you know, formulated very clearly in that interview that we are very much for that meeting. But we still have in mind one or two practical disarmament problems which have to be resolved during that....

[Pozner, interrupting] We'll get back to that in a (?minute). You made a point there that I'd like to enlarge on and perhaps, you could, Dr Plekhanov, and that is that the moratorium would seem to be a testing stone that would define a government's, society's, attitude towards the whole issue of nuclear disarmament or the arms race. Do you think that's so and do you feel that that is point that was made strongly in this interview?

[Plekhanov] That's right. That's exactly the point. Comrade Gorbachev ran down the arguments against the moratorium, arguments in favor of continuing the testing of nuclear weapons, and he went through all the formal objections that were made by the U.S. Government, largely concerned with verification, with the number of tests, with the kinds of weapons that are being tested, with the problem of reliability testing which we have discussed in one of our "Top Priority" shows. And then he, I think, was able to demonstrate very persuasively that all those objections are worth nothing because if there has been any questions they have been removed by the (?acts) of the Soviet Government and the proposals that we have made concerning verification and so on. And so the year that has passed since the Soviet moratorium started has revealed what are the real objections to a moratorium and I think one of the very vivid portions of the Gorbachev interview had to do with this litany of why the moratorium is not necessary. He said if you want military superiority, of course you don't need a moratorium. [passage omitted]

[Pozner] Did you want to say something Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Yeh, I just would like to say one thing. You know, it happens so that nowadays moratorium is the focusing point of the policies of two countries. It's a real testing ground for the genuine arms control, genuine desire to get rid of nuclear weapons, and if you read carefully that interview you will see that the secretary general went out of his, you know, to sum up all the American objections, the whole American position, and he gave answers to any one of American objections to the moratorium. I believe they sound very convincing and I wish our American listeners, that they read it....

[Pozner, interrupting] And not only our American listeners but our listeners that we have all over the world.

[Bogdanov] All over the world, that they read it carefully.

[Plekhanov] If they had an opportunity, I'm not sure they have the opportunity.

[Bogdanov] That's why, Sergey, that's why I'm giving that advice to our listeners because, and I started my comment with my worry, you know, that they have no opportunity to read it because it has not been given a proper, you know, place in the Western and American mass media.

[Pozner] When I interrupted you a couple of minutes ago you were talking about what General Secretary Gorbachev had said concerning a possible summit meeting, U.S.-Soviet summit meeting. Now, in the United States you get the impression, at least when you read the U.S. newspapers, that to begin with at Geneva the two leaders absolutely agreed to have a summit in 1986, regardless of anything. That's the impression you get, and number two that of course there will be a summit, it's a foregone conclusion that there will be a summit. And in fact we know that President Reagan has on several occasion spoken about internal pressures in the Soviet Union that are going to push and force the general secretary to go for this summit, and so on. I think that in connection with that what he said in this interview makes it quite clear just what the Soviet position is on a summit, and I would appreciate it if either of you would elucidate a little bit on that subject for our listeners.

[Plekhanov] There are several points there. Number 1, yes the Soviet Union is preparing for the summit and we consider a summit to be important and we think that a summit can become a major event in Soviet-American relations. But it can be such an event and can serve a good purpose providing there is progress on at least one or two major substantive points concerning the problem of the arms race. This is what the summit is for. Not in order to, you know, to get together and let Comrade Gorbachev see the beauties of Washington D.C. or some other place. So that is an important point because there is a danger with all the proclivities of the American media and the American politicians for window dressing, for really making a big fuss over nothing and creating false impressions, creating illusions. There is a danger that if there is a summit without substance, that those people who are not really interested in stopping the arms race, but want simply a lot of window dressing to put people to sleep, that those people'll be able to say well don't you see everything is going fine.

[Bogdanov] Yeh, and you know there is one point which confirms very much what you have said just now. Just let's have a look at what has happened after the Geneva Summit meeting.

[Plekhanov] Exactly.

[Bogdanov] We, all of us, we have expected that will bring us to very nearby arms control, real arms control solutions. But between Geneva and now we have no progress at all in those controls. I would say even that things became worse than they were at the time of the summit meeting. So we have an impression that all that period was used by the American side as a cover up for the arms race. Now, we have all the right to suspect that if the summit meeting will go the way they want it to go, that will be another cover, maybe more serious for the arms race and for American breakthrough to the outer space, you know. Now what worries me and really makes me very unhappy, that's the distortion of the truth, you know, if you, distortion of the spirit of Geneva, distortion of the situation. For instance, we have a number of meetings of different groups of Soviet and American experts. The other side, the American Administration, creates an impression that's all about summit meeting. Nothing [word indistinct]. It's just to prepare the meeting of two foreign ministers, which has nothing to do with the summit; for two foreign ministers have to find out whether there is a ground for the summit. Now my suspicion is, and growing suspicion, that the other side is creating, you know, a proper environment to blame the Soviet side, that just because of their policy the summit meeting didn't take place and if you know, you know, the people sitting at the places in Washington you may say that my suspicion is not groundless suspicion.

[Plekhanov] You know, one of those people, Kenneth Adelman, a few years ago made an immortal statement which I think quite often comes to mind when one thinks about these issues. He said the arms talks are a sham we have to practice in order to keep the

American people and the allies happy. He made that statement and he's never backtracked from it, and I think that says a lot about the attitude of the Reagan administration.

[Pozner] Well, thank you both very much. Hopefully now our listeners know a little bit more about what is really a very important interview and which sadly has not been made visible to the readership in the United States and in many other Western countries.

Gorbachev Answers Circulated at UN

LD171748 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 17 Sep 86

[Text] New York September 17 TASS -- The text of the answers of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to questions of the RUDE PRAVO editor-in-chief Zdenek Horeni has been circulated at the United Nations as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council.

The attitude to termination of nuclear tests, the early elaboration of the treaty to ban these tests have most convincingly shown today how serious is each of the big nuclear powers in its attitude to disarmament, international security and the cause of peace, the document says.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON U.S. 11 SEPTEMBER TEST

TASS Report

LD120315 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 11 Sep 86

[Text] Washington September 11 TASS — TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports.

A spokesman for the U.S. Energy Department in the Nevada test range said that on Thursday the United States conducted a new nuclear test codenamed "Aleman". In his words it was linked with the development of nuclear weapons. The nuclear device was exploded in an underground silo at a depth of nearly 500 metres at a distance of roughly 120 kilometres from Las Vegas. As the spokesman for the Energy Department said the yield of the blast was less than 20 kilotons.

He said that the latest nuclear test in Nevada had been the ninth officially announced blast this year. A total of 655 officially announced nuclear tests have been conducted by the USA since 1951.

The latest blast is already the sixteenth test to have been announced by Washington since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts. Considering the tests, which have not been announced at all, the United States has conducted over that period a total of 20 nuclear blasts. The public organisation American Peace Test says that the United States intends to continue nuclear testing. Thus, in particular, on September 26 a nuclear blast codenamed Labquark is to be conducted. Another three nuclear tests have been scheduled for October.

The main cause why these tests are conducted is to carry on the programme for developing new types of nuclear weapons to replenish the existing arsenal, noted Robert Norris and Thomas Cochran, officials of the U.S. Natural Resources Defence Council, in an article published in the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST. The U.S. military laboratories, scientists say, are at present engaged in work to create nuclear pumped weapons for the star wars programme and other aims. They claim that from 500 to 1,000 nuclear tests will be necessary for their development effort. According to the authors, the imposition of a mutual moratorium on nuclear blasts, which is now unilaterally observed by the Soviet Union, will gradually slow down, and in the final analysis, halt the process of the creation of these weapons, a development which the Pentagon fears.

Scientists from the Natural Resources Defence Council, who are participating in the joint Soviet-American experiments, say that at present there are technical facilities for the verification of observance of the ban on nuclear testing. It takes only political will to introduce such a moratorium.

TASS Commentary

LD122128 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Commentary by TASS Political Commentator Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] A report from Washington: As a representative of the department of energy of the United States of America stated to a TASS correspondent, the 20th underground nuclear explosion since the introduction of the Soviet moratorium, carried out at the testing ground in Nevada on the 11 September, code-named Aleman, was connected with the development of nuclear weapons.

At the microphone is TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov:

[Kornilov] Stubbornly refusing to respond to the USSR's call to ban all nuclear explosions, U.S. ruling circles, as is known, are trying to give their militarist line a kind of propagandist guarantee -- and what cock-and-bull stories don't they put out in order to belittle the significance of the Soviet moratorium and to justify their own negative position! Here and throughout, there are false arguments to the effect, as they say, that neither a unilateral moratorium, nor even a bilateral agreement with the United States on this question supposedly will give anything to resolving the problem of nuclear disarmament. There are also fabrications about the USSR supposedly having outstripped the United States, although it is known that the United States has carried out 1 and 1/2 times more nuclear explosions, and in the past 5 to 10 years, it has systematically left our country behind in the quantity of such explosions by almost one-third. Speculations have been built on sand to the effect that supposedly a ban on nuclear tests is impossible to monitor [prokontrolirovat] although scientists in various countries, including in the United States, are unanimous that there are means for monitoring [kontrol] and that they are most reliable. In reality it goes without saying, the fact that Washington -- not taking into account the opinion of the world public, including that of the United States -- is continuing nuclear tests at testing grounds in Nevada, this fact is connected not with the mythical lagging behind on the part of the United States and not with the mythical problems of monitoring. It is connected with the striving of certain circles in the United States, acting to please the military-industrial complex, the weapons kings, to continue the arms race at any cost, and with their attempts to transfer such a race into spheres. It is this fact that once more corroborates the revelation of the representative of the U.S. energy department.

The press and authorative experts have often reported that nuclear tests, which THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper with good reason describes as the key to setting fire to the entire arms race, aim to create new types of weapons and that they are being carried out within the framework of work to create space weapons. This in essence was admitted in the statement by the representative of the department of energy. Thus, it has once again been confirmed that the aim of nuclear explosions at testing grounds in Nevada is the creation of new and more perfected types of weapons; and it is an illusory calculation by those in power in Washington that, as they say, by hook or by crook, they will succeed in (?destroying) the balance of forces that has been establishing and in ensuring military superiority for the United States. It is this very political line which has led to the fact that despite all the USSR's efforts, the sides, since the Geneva meeting, have not come even an inch closer to an agreement on reducing weapons. It is a dangerous, very dangerous course.

Monitoring Issue Dismissed

LD122321 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 12 Sep 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] Hello, comrades. You already know from radio and press reports that an underground nuclear explosion has been carried out at the test site in the State of Nevada -- the 20th since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.

To the accompaniment of the Nevada blasts, official Washington continues to shy away from the Soviet proposal for a mutual ban on all nuclear explosions.

In order that it should do nothing for such a ban, the U.S. Administration -- as is obvious from statements by its representatives -- is not adverse to working pretty hard to think up more and more arguments against a moratorium. One of them is: the impossibility of monitoring nuclear tests. The United States puts this argument forward everytime there is any possibility of getting the process of limiting the race of nuclear and other arms moving again. The same has happened this time. However, that argument no longer works. In the first place, national verification devices have become so reliable that even the smallest explosion can be pin-pointed. Thus, all the U.S. underground nuclear explosions carried out in 1985 and 1986 and not declared by the United States have been detected in the Soviet Union. Naturally, the Americans also have similar equipment. The effectiveness of these devices is confirmed by the Washington administration itself which does not cast doubt on the fact that the Soviet Union is observing its unilateral moratorium.

Soviet and American scientists agreed to install seismographs near the nuclear test sites of the USSR and the United States. When the American experts checked their instruments in Kazakhstan, their leader said: We have achieved great successes in the field of developing high-frequency seismological equipment, and now have a better chance than ever before of agreeing on a total nuclear test ban.

"The Delhi Six" offered their services in organizing monitoring, and the Soviet Union has accepted that offer. If it becomes necessary to set up an international and national network to monitor the cessation of tests, the Soviet Union is willing to do so. So, what are we waiting for? What is lacking is the main thing: A desire on the part of the Reagan administration to stop nuclear explosions. Why? Well, listen to what Robert Norris and Thomas Cochrane of the Natural Resources Council of America, wrote in yesterday's WASHINGTON POST: American military laboratories are working on atomically-charged weapons for the star wars program; in order to develop them, between 500 and 1,000 new nuclear tests will be needed.

In the folklore of the American soldier there is an expression: He's dead, but he won't lie down. At the Nevada test site, the Washington administration has itself killed all its reasons and arguments against a moratorium, yet it is still trying to invent new ones. It is trying because otherwise the possible answer to the question: Is America preparing to fight a war? is yes. But to admit that would be to place oneself beyond the pale of human society and human society has a sense of self-preservation that prompts an even deeper awareness of the reality of the nuclear threat.

'Absurd Logic'

LD122223 Moscow TASS in English 2136 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 12 TASS — Follows commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, a TASS military writer:

The current U.S. Administration's record of nuclear tests gives a clear idea of the real worth of speeches by official spokesmen for Washington about their wish to make the nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

The twenty nuclear blasts in the U.S. test range in Nevada after the Soviet Union introduced unilaterally its moratorium on August 6, 1986, clearly brings to light Washington's attitude to the very idea of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons.

Putting an end to nuclear tests cannot do damage either to the security of the United States, which, for that matter, has conducted more nuclear blasts than all other countries of the world combined, nor to the security of other states. A ban on blasts would be a measure easy to implement and verify, while being exceptionally effective as regards curbing the arms race and lessening the danger of a catastrophic war.

It is precisely due to the ease of implementation and effectiveness of a ban on nuclear blasts that the problem of tests is rightly considered to be a litmus-paper, which makes it possible to determine quite accurately the real attitude of some or other government to the whole package of the questions of war and peace.

Who will believe that the administration, which refuses even to discuss the question on an end to nuclear blasts, or for a start, on joining in the moratorium on tests, really wishes to eliminate the nuclear weapons?

While refusing to follow the good example of the USSR, which has for more than 400 days now unilaterally abided by the moratorium, the current U.S. Administration has demonstrated that it does not give serious thought to eliminating the nuclear threat to mankind. The Washington leaders, after the USSR has put an end to all nuclear tests, have blown 20 nuclear devices in Nevada and failed in the test of political maturity in front of the whole mankind.

The current U.S. Administration is trying to assure world public that the continuation of nuclear tests in the Nevada test range contributes to strengthening peace and stability on our planet, while the Soviet moratorium, as they claim, hampers progress at the disarmament talks. Following this absurd logic one can draw the conclusion that the safest place for human beings is the crater of a flaming volcano, while the best method to prevent a fire is to pack one's home with gasoline and gun powder.

Continuing nuclear tests means wasting one's energies and funds on aims which are in conflict with the vital interests of the whole of mankind, while the need to turn these energies and funds to good humane matters has incredibly grown.

The world has entered a period of responsible decisions. The Soviet Union wishes to strengthen by its actions hope in the peoples that it is possible to change the present-day dangerous international developments and prove that there is a realistic alternative to the military confrontation.

Instead of wasting the next 10-15 years in the creation of new systems of mass destruction weapons it is necessary to take up reducing the nuclear arsenals and in the long run achieve their total scrapping.

An agreement on ending nuclear blasts could be the first important step on the way towards resolving that truly history-making task.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: U.S. DELAYS VISAS FOR N-TEST MONITORING MEETING

LD161921 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 16 Sep 86

[Text] New York September 16 TASS — By TASS Correspondent Maksim Knyazkov. A group of prominent Soviet scientists could not arrive in the United States in time to attend a conference on the problems of ending nuclear tests and install seismological equipment for monitoring nuclear explosions and the reason was an obviously deliberate "delay" in granting them U.S. entry visas, Jacob Sherr, a spokesman for a U.S. mass organization called the national resources defense council, said in Denver, Colorado.

Four representatives of the Soviet Academy of Sciences planned to arrive in Denver Sunday so that to start work at the conference, sponsored by Colorado State University, from Monday. The Soviet scientists were to exchange experience there with American colleagues in monitoring nuclear tests. After the forum they planned to go to Nevada to install seismological pickups in the area of the U.S. nuclear testing range.

All these activities were to be conducted under an agreement signed by the U.S. National Resources Defense Council with the Soviet Acacemy of Sciences earlier this year. It is in keeping with that agreement that American scientists have set up seismological instruments near Semipalatinsk to monitor activities at the Soviet nuclear testing range. That monitoring station has been in service for several months now, manned by rotating groups of American scientists.

The Soviet Union has thereby visually demonstrated its readiness to ensure the strictest verification of its compliance with a Soviet-U.S. nuclear test ban agreement, if it is signed. The State Department's "delay" in granting visas to the Soviet scientists, which has in effect jeopardized the plan to install seismological equipment, has demonstrated clearly, by contrast, that Washington's claims of "readiness for on-site inspections" are bluff meant to mislead world opinion.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S VORONTSOV ON TEST BAN, SUMMIT CHANCES

PM110813 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 4-5

[Article by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, under the general headline "The Historic Chance Must Not Be Missed": "A Diplomat's View. Halt the Nuclear Malaise"]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's announcement that the Soviet Union is to extend its unilateral nuclear test moratorium is at the centre of international attention. The overwhelming majority of governments, politicians and public figures the world over are categorically advocating the immediate cessation of nuclear explosions. Only a stubborn influential minority in the U.S. want nuclear explosions to continue to shake the earth.

Washington is now very nervous. Contradictory arguments are being put forward concerning America's continued nuclear testing. White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan says that the U.S. would not be averse to a treaty for a complete, comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban, but it cannot accept such a treaty without a reliable control system. Other spokesmen for the U.S. President discard the control excuse altogether and bluntly assert that the U.S. needs the tests to develop more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Washington is likewise confused as to who is ahead of whom in nuclear armaments. Effectively, the U.S. can offer no plausible explanation for its refusal to join the Soviet moratorium; one is forced to conclude that it needs nuclear explosions simply to carry on with the nuclear arms race in its attempt to obtain military superiority. Naturally, the matter is not at all one of control.

For the Soviet Union control is no problem. This is graphically illustrated by the joint experiment staged by U.S. and Soviet scientists in the Semipalatinsk area in the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Government favoured the agreement to conduct this experiment and said it was prepared to contribute to this implementation. So far Washington has not expressed readiness for a parallel experiment in the U.S.A.

It is now obvious that Washington is motivated not by concern for control, but by efforts to cover up the continued development of new nuclear weapons, specifically to use the energy of nuclear explosions to implement the "star wars" programme.

The Soviet Union greatly appreciates the joint action taken by the heads of state and government of the Group of Six -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, to secure the earliest cessation of nuclear explosions. For our part we have already said that we are prepared to accept their offer to help verify a nuclear test ban, including on site inspection with the proviso, of course, that this is accepted by the U.S. We also view favorably the proposal to arrange a meeting between experts from

these countries and their Soviet and U.S. counterparts, and this was stated by Mikhail Gorbachev in his reply to the heads of state and government of the six countries published on August 24.

We have no objection to talks being resumed with the participation of Britain. We have had such tripartite (the U.S.S.R., the U.S. and Britain) talks in the past, but they broke down through no fault of ours. We would welcome any moves from France in this field. Yet today it is the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. that should come up with concrete proposals for a test ban. However, we would welcome other countries subsequently joining both the moratorium and an agreement should it be concluded.

Today there is every grounds for definitively checking the nuclear malaise on earth through a Soviet-U.S. moratorium and a subsequent relevant agreement. After all, the moratorium should not be viewed as a step to end nuclear tests alone, but within the context of the overall problem of ridding humanity of nuclear weapons, as a prologue to full nuclear disarmament. The stopping of nuclear explosions might be one of the threads by which we could begin to unwind the entire tangle of the problem of nuclear disarmament. If there are no explosions, no new nuclear weapons will be devised, and serious limitations will be imposed on weapons that already exist. This would apply equally to the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

The West is suggesting an intermediate agreement evisaging a gradual reduction in the number of nuclear explosions. Proposals of this order are prompted by the desire to keep open a loophole for the arms race. Indeed, one might ask, why continue nuclear testing in a restricted form when such testing can be ended generally and immediately? The conditions for this exist. The U.S.S.R. is prepared to end tests completely and the Group of Six is advocating this.

It is to be hoped that eventually common sense will gain the upper hand in Washington and the historic chance of ending the arms race will not be missed. We repeat once again that an agreement with the U.S. to end nuclear testing, with fully reliable verification including on-site inspection, is conceivable, and that it can be achieved in a short space of time. An agreement to this effect could be signed at the U.S.S.R.-U.S. summit, which in turn may well materialize if its producitivity is ensured and the appropriate political atmosphere generated. Meanwhile, there is no agreement on a firm date for a new Gorbachev-Reagan meeting, contrary to statements that have appeared in some Western mass media.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA'S BOVIN GIVES REASSURANCE ON MORATORIUM

PM111005 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 4-5

[IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin article under the rubic "Taking Up a Point" -- first six paragraphs are readers' letters]

[Text] To each new piece of sabre-rattling against you, to each new escalation of the arms race, you reply with new proposals to negotiate, with new peace bids.

while you take pride in your highly moral stand, certain guarters continue to prepare for war against you. It is naive to think that these irreconcilable, brutal moneygrubbers will heed such "abstract" notions as morality, honour, commitment to pledges, etc. I think Soviet patience will not yield the desired results in this case. Rather will it lull popular vigilance and ease the West's way to war.

G.S., British Columbia, Canada

It seems to me as if the U.S.S.R. is always backing down while the U.S., imperialism, generally, is toughening its demands. You have taken initiatives enough. Unless the U.S. stops nuclear testing, there should be no extension of the moratorium. Not one more step back. Otherwise we may see a disaster far worse than that of 1941.

Vaclav Koci, Pardubice, Czechoslovakia

I wholeheartedly support Mikhail Gorbachev's statement. I too raise my voice for peace on Earth, an end to nuclear testing, and a complete ban on atomic weapons. Yet I am anxious. Won't the Americans think that we are demobilizing, that in time we shall be less strong, in the sense that we will lag behind present-day levels of armaments!

L. Kovalenko, Donetsk Region, USSR

Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA news analyst, replies:

I understand what motivates these letters to NEW TIMES, their concern, and their anxiety. Yet, I am sure that the Soviet political leaders who decided to extend the moratorium were aware of this concern and realized what motivated this anxiety.

Let us analyze the Gorbachev statement once again and attempt to assess the situation together.

Let me begin by noting that as a rule responsible political decisions are not easily taken. This is certainly the case with regard to the decision taken by the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau and Soviet Government to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. Mikhail Gorbachev said this was not a simple move, but an extraordinarily responsible and difficult one. Indeed, to adopt the right decision, it was essential to give the fullest consideration to every aspect of the problem, and compare political with military-technological factors.

We have now had no tests for over a year. Conventional logic suggests that if tests are needed to strengthen security, a unilateral refusal to conduct such tests could adversely affect national security and place the U.S. at a strategic advantage.

There is good reason to think so. But in the first place we, like the Americans, have substantial reserves of strength, which means that it would be hard to gain, or lose, any essential strategic advantage. Maintaining military-strategic parity is the best antidote to any ventures in this situation. In the second place, there is a time limit to unilateral action. If Washington continues with its stubborn "No," if it continues to detonate nuclear devices, we shall be forced to resume testing.

Yet the main thing, as I see it, is that in this nuclear age security built on arms escalation becomes increasingly dangerous.

You must agree that the more weapons we have, the more mistrust there will be, and the more there is of that the greater the likelihood will be of these weapons being used. Only political accord, a reciprocal agreement to cut back and subsequently completely abolish nuclear weapons can give us genuine security.

Our approach to nuclear explosions, along with other concrete proposals and concrete actions, is geared to the attainment of this fundamental objective.

All analogies are tentative and conventional. However, let us seek a parallel with the game of chess currently popular the world over. To gain in quality the player may sacrifice quantity. The same may be said of the moratorium. For the time being its political advantages outweigh the disadvantages in the sphere of military technology.

I mean that by extending the moratorium we are strengthening the Soviet Union's political position, and our country's prestige. We are stepping up the pressure against the Americans, curtailing their freedom of action, and proving their helpless, invented arguments invalid. We are also giving an additional incentive to the anti-war and anti-nuclear movement, and are strengthening the position of the non-aligned countries.

The Soviet Union is saying again and again that we should take a new approach to the entire range of issues related to security, and proceed from a balance based on fear to one based on trust, a balance of interests, as only this approach accords with the realities of our nuclear age.

I fully admit that we may not reach agreement with the present U.S. Administration. However, the history of the country does not end with Reagan's presidency. Our action has the long term in mind.

Now about 1941. I think the comparison of this nature is wrong. It fails to recognize the fundamental changes of quality since then in the sphere of military strategy. Today no potential aggressor can hope to win. He who shoots first dies second. That

is how the matter stands and the Americans realize this. In this context the surprise factor also appears in a different light. Today nobody will be caught napping. Retaliation is inevitable.

Such is the picture.

So there is no need for anxiety. We know we were dealing with. We have no illusions. We are strong enough not to accept the "rules of the game" that they want us to play. T brawn we oppose brawn plus brain. To adventurist hankerings we oppose a sense of responsibility, fortitude and conviction, the conviction that humanity will be able to surmount the crisis phase, avoid the catastrophe, and create a world without wars and without arms.

Is this utopian? The goal of history is, after all, to make utopia a reality.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER DISCUSSES VERIFICATION

PM131407 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Captain 2d Rank Ye. Nikitin: "Hackneyed Arguments"]

[Text] Since mankind became aware of its existence, there have been a considerable number of strained, difficult, and crucial periods in its development. It has been threatened by starvation and terrible epidemics, natural disasters and devastating wars taking hundreds of thousands and even millions of lives. But never have people been faced with such an ominous danger of universal annihilation. The mythical "Sword of Damocles" has assumed quite concrete forms: Tens of thousands of nuclear munitions. And this sword is hanging over our planet.

This danger has been particularly clearly highlighted by two tragedies connected with the technology of the nuclear-space age: The deaths of the "Challenger" crew and the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. They served as a cruel reminder that people are still in the process of familiarizing themselves with the fantastic, powerful forces which they themselves created and are still only learning to place at the service of progress. These events served as an object lesson of what would happen if nuclear weapons were used.

Under these conditions the chief and only path to security is the total elimination of these terrible mass destruction weapons. And the most effective means of resolving this problem is to stop all nuclear explosions. Sober-minded specialists, scientists, politicians, and members of the military are of like mind with regard to the fact that ending nuclear tests really securely closes the channels for improving nuclear weapons. And this task is paramount. Resolving it would place a barrier in the way of creating even more sophisticated, lethal types of nuclear weapons. This is also clear to the nonspecialist. Even the American WASHINGTON POST, assessing the importance of the Soviet Union's extension of the nuclear test moratorium it introduced more than a year ago, was forced to admit that "tests are the ignition key to the entire arms race: It is enough to turn this key--and the motor will die."

A moratorium on nuclear explosions would be the first practical step on the way to a general improvement in the international situation. The

juggernaut [sostav] loaded to the top with nuclear weapons is gathering speed with every passing day. Prudence tells us that it must be stopped before it is too late. This fact is elementary and clear to all.

One must suppose that Washington also well understands this. Understands, but is in no way able to renounce its pernicious aspirations to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union. Even in the 1980 Republican Party platform there is a clause which states directly that the United States must aspire to superiority. This mirage continues to obscure Washington strategists' real perception of the world even today. But the joint Soviet-American statement signed in Geneva clearly states that the sides "will not aspire to superiority."

The Soviet Union strictly adheres to the accords reached and does not seek unilateral advantages and benefits for itself. Our country took the difficult decision to introduce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and has repeatedly extended it.

This cannot be said of the United States, however. It continues to follow its militarist course, refuses to join the Soviet moratorium, and thinks up various pretexts and hackneyed arguments in its justification.

One of the most weighty "arguments" in favor of its obstructionist policy of many years up until the present day has been the completely far-fetched, totally unfounded problem of verification [kontrol]. "We are not against a treaty on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapon tests, but we are against the conclusion of such a treaty without an appropriate system of verification. "[Proverka]," White House Chief of Staff Regan said recently. "We want to be able to check what they are doing and we think they would also like to know what we are doing."

Well, this seems to be totally logical. What is holding things up, one asks? After all, these issues were the subject of detailed discussion 6 years ago within the framework of tripartite negotiations involving the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain. The Soviet Union developed and proposed a clear-cut verification [kontrol] system. It included the use of both national technical means and international measures for this purpose. In addition to the consultations and exchange of information generally accepted in agreements and treaties, the international measures primarily envisaged the exchange of seismic data, which is the most effective instrument in recording a nuclear explosion.

The Soviet Union envisages on-site inspection [proverka] as an important integral part of verification [kontrol]. And consent to the installation of American monitoring apparatus in the Semipalatinsk region is clear evidence of this. Our country is also prepared to make use of the proposal by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania, who have offered assistance in verifying [proverka] an end to nuclear tests. What is more, the Soviet Union is willing to reach agreement on additional verification [kontrol] measures.

In short, the USSR's position on the verification [kontrol] problem is quite clear. And its readiness to enter into the broadest forms, into any forms of verification [kontrol]--both national and international, even including on-site inspection--has knocked the ground once and for all from under the feet of the rulers of present-day America. The verification [kontrol] argument immediately "lost its luster," as American political observers themselves note. And Washington's position, in the words of THE WASHINGTON POST, presents an unseemly sight, "when the administration is dragged kicking to talks on a treaty on a general ban on nuclear weapon tests."

Driven into a corner by the Soviet Union's peace initiatives which are indestructible in terms of their logic, the present leaders of the American Administration try to substantiate their refusal to join the moratorium with far-fetched references to the need to safeguard the "security of the United States and its friends and allies." In this connection they talk about the fact that nuclear tests are necessary to the United States "for maintaining its deterrent forces at the proper level" because, so they say, reliance on strategic nuclear forces is still the basis of American policy.

In actual fact, there is not a grain of truth in this claim either. The nuclear tests conducted today have no bearing on deterrence. They are certainly not the result of any need to verify [proveryat] the reliability of existing arsenals. This is said both by Soviet and by Western military and technical specialists. Even the American press admits that of all the nuclear explosions conducted by Washington today only 5 percent of the tests have this purpose. Nuclear weapons already long tested have been stockpiled to such a degree that if they were to be reduced not merely twice over, but three, four, five times over, there would still be enough left for deterrence.

The picture would seem to be quite clear and not requiring further elucidation. And obviously it is precisely for this reason that certain Western mass information media are attempting to present black as white and vice versa. They are striving to instil the idea in public opinion that the Soviet initiative is supposedly "propaganda." This is truly absurd. Really, how can one talk of propaganda if our country has not only declared a moratorium but is putting its words into practice? And how sarcastically T. Downey, member of the U.S. Congress House of Representatives, observed when commenting on the appeal by the "Delhi Six" in favor of the speediest end to nuclear explosions, "the U.S. Administration can in no way call this step by the six states a propaganda conspiracy with Moscow."

The real reason for the United States' obstructionist position both on the issue of ending nuclear tests and on other problems of vital importance to mankind is primarily that the political thinking of the U.S. leaders lags dangerously behind the realities of the present day and the profound changes that have taken place in international life and in the world in general. It has in fact closed ranks with the thinking of the owners of

the "production lines of death" manufacturing sophisticated destruction weapons capable of destroying civilization on earth.

The military business, as it well known, is very rapacious and merciless. Yesterday it needed millions, today billions, tomorrow trillions. But it is not only the thirst for profit that whips up the arms race. The interests of the bosses of the military-industrial complex are at one with the ambitious interests of the ruling elite. And they count on achieving several goals: Not to allow any drop in the profits on arms production; to secure military superiority for the United States; to try to exhaust the Soviet Union economically and ultimately secure command positions in the world, fulfill long-standing imperial ambitions, and continue to pursue a policy of robbery in relation to the developing countries.

A cursory glance at the U.S. nuclear rearmament program is enough to understand where the militarist course of the American rulers is leading. The United States intends to deploy 100 MX intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMS). It is planned to equip each missile with 10 nuclear warheads each with a yield of 600 kilotons. This means that 1,000 warheads will be added to the present arsenal, each of these warheads being 30 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

It is also planned to deploy 1,000 "Midgetman" missiles which will be taken into service at the beginning of the nineties. This is another 1,000 nuclear warheads.

The D-5 missile is being expeditiously created for "Trident" nuclear missile submarines. The Pentagon intends to purchase 744 missiles, each of which will be equipped with 7-14 warheads. This will be an additional 5-10,000 nuclear warheads.

B-1B and ATB heavy bombers for the U.S. strategic airforce are being created and deployed, and there are plans to use them as delivery vehicles for the new generation of nuclear weapons. This will be another several thousand nuclear munitions.

Finally, thousands of new cruise missiles of both present and future generations are to be added. There will be more than 8,000 of these.

It is not difficult to calculate that in the event of a U.S. refusal to join the Soviet moratorium the already excessive number of nuclear munitions will be swelled by tens of thousands of new nuclear charges. And this is only in the strategic range. But we must also take account of the fact that Washington is implementing a large-scale program in the sphere of operational-tactical and tactical nuclear weapons.

The White House position regarding the Soviet nuclear test moratorium is therefore rooted precisely in the unrestrained nuclear arms race and the almost total militarization of the country.

The military people who are particularly responsible for our state's defense capability are closely following the actions of the U.S. administration in the sphere of the development of its military and technical potential. And those across the ocean should not entertain illusions that they have a monopoly on scientific and technical progress in military matters. This problem is now being resolved in not one but many directions.

The Soviet Union can visualize the dangers posed by the uncontrolled buildup of nuclear arsenals and by the adventurist program for the U.S. creation of space-based strike weapons. But for every action reliable means of counteraction can be found, and they will not necessarily be what the United States expects. Our own science and industry, the armed defenders of the motherland, and all Soviet people will be able to give a worthy response to American attempts to tip the present military and strategic balance in their favor.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: SWEDISH CD ENVOY SAYS MONITORING 'ABSOLUTELY RELIABLE'

PM101611 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Kuznetsov report: "Peaceful Challenge"]

[Text] Geneva--M.S. Gorbachev's statement takes into consideration the positions of governments and strata of the world public concerned by the nuclear arms race, R. Ekeus, head of the Swedish delegation at the Disarmament Conference, has stressed.

The Soviet moratorium and its extension for another 6 months is an important contribution to the work of the multilateral forum represented by our conference. Taking this decision was a difficult and crucial point in state life if one considers that another 18 underground nuclear explosions have been carried out at the Nevada testing ground during the Soviet moratorium, three of these explosions going unannounced. The United States continues to improve its nuclear weapons, and so one must have a deep understanding of one's responsibility for the fate of peace to take a risk for the sake of resolving a cardinal task--the task of ending nuclear tests. The Soviet Union has thrown down a challenge, but it is a peaceful challenge, and we urge other countries to follow this decision.

I agree that the only way to overcome confrontational deadlocks is through the study and consideration of others' viewpoints and through dialogues and contacts, discussions and talks. Yes, it is essential to melt the ice of mutual distrust, and the Disarmament Conference presents a fine opportunity for this. Taking the positions of other states into account, the Swedish delegation has submitted a proposal formulated in Document SD/712. As we have indicated in the document, the technical means are now available to detect and identify the smallest underground explosions. The international community has at its disposal effective monitoring devices, and we in Sweden firmly say: It is impossible to conceal any nuclear explosion even if it is carried out in deep underground caverns.

A comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests would place a barrier in the way of the arms race but, of course, it would have to be effective, global, and verifiable. It has already been proved (including by the fact that the unannounced explosions in the United States were detected) that today's seismology is absolutely reliable and, in conjunction with on-site

verification and inspection, would form a well-balanced system to verify the proposed agreements on a nuclear test ban. Together with other neutral and nonaligned states, Sweden is in favor of drawing up an agreement on the prevention of an arms race in space, which is included on the conference agenda. Nuclear weapons can and must be outlawed.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: PYONGYANG CONFERENCE URGES KOREAN NFZ

Kim Il-song Addresses Conference

LD061954 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 6 Sep 86

[Text] Pyongyang September 6 TASS -- The People's Democratic Republic of Korea actively supports the Soviet Union s peace initiatives aimed at the defence of peace and security all over the world, and expresses solidarity with the Soviet people's struggle for their implementation, said general secretary of the Korean Workers' Party, PDRK President Kim Il-song. He was addressing a meeting in Pyongyang today with the participants in the current international conference for nuclear-free, peaceful Korean peninsula. The proposals of the CPSU and the Soviet Government on a ban on nuclear testing, a cut in nuclear weapons, prevention of militarisation of outer space and total elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons, as well as the extension by it of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts clearly demonstrate the the CPSU, the USSR are pursuing a peaceful foreign policy, [words indistinct] displaying a responsible attitude to questions pertaining to he elimination of the nuclear threat and defence of peace and security on earth, Kim Il-song stressed.

Conference Supports Gorbachev Proposals

LD072158 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 7 Sep 86

[Text] Pyongyang September 7 TASS -- Struggle for the suppression of centres of the war threat in different regions is one of the more important tasks of all the peace forces in the world, the participants in an additional conference for a nuclear-free and peaceful Korean Peninsula, taking place in the capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, point out. Their speeches are evidence of te strong impact on the peace efforts of the Soviet Union's program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the current century and the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. These initiatives were appreciated by delegates from Mozambique, the USA, Burundi, Malta and a number of other countries, who called upon all the nuclear powers to follow the Soviet example. Peace campaigners from Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia voiced support for the concept of strengthening peace and security in Asia and the Pacific, put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech in Vladivostok. Mirsahib Karwal, an alternate member of the Politbureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, characterized the Soviet Union's decision to return six Soviet regiments from Afghanistan back home as a manifestation of the goodwill of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan and their sincere desire to achieve a political solution of the problems of the regions.

Mikhail Gorbachev presented in his speech in Vladivostok an integral and consistent program of action aimed to ensure that Asia and the Pacific are no longer a source of tension or a scene of war preparations and that this region beocmes effectively involved in the overall process of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security, proposed at the 27th CPSU Congress, Zaura Kadyrove, the leader of the Soviet delegation, who is secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, said in her speech. It is characteristic of the Soviet approach that it relies on the invigorating of the efforts of the Asian countries themselves with a view to the formulation of measures to ensure peace and stability in the region. That is why the Soviet Union thinks highly of the peace policy of the Korean Republic of Korea and their efforts to establish a nuclear-free zone of peace in the Korean peninsula.

PRAVDA Commentary

PM111414 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Razuvayev dispatch: "Peace and Tranquillity to the Korean Peninsula"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 9 Sep -- "Transforming the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace." This was the theme of an international conference held in Pyongyang 6-8 September. It was attended by more than 120 delegations from 78 countries, including the Soviet Union, and also by representatives of a number of international democratic organizations.

The topicality of the problems discussed at the conference is self-evident and their solution is long overdue. As a result of aggressive U.S. Intrigues, Korea has been divided for more than 40 years now and its southern part has been transformed into a military-nuclear bridgehead of the Pentagon. Forty thousand U.S. servicemen are permanently stationed there, and more than 200 military installation are located there, including bases and arms dumps at which many hundred units of nuclear weapons are stored. It was stated at the conference that with the "full agreement" of its rulers several tens of experimental samples of the neutron bomb have been brought to South Korea from accross the ocean. A decision to deploy Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on its territory has been adopted recently. Provocative scenarios of "limited nuclear war" are regularly rehearsed near the territory of the DPRK. At the same time, efforts to pull together a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul militarized triangle are being stepped up. All this, the conference participants declared from the rostrum, has exacerbated the situation on the Korean peninsula to a dangerous degree and has transformed it into one of the world's explosive spots.

Understandably, aggressive actions of this kind on the part of the U.S. ruling circle and their Seoul placemen cannot fail to evoke the Koreans' justified concern. Their alarm is shared by the peoples of Asia and all people who treasure peace and security. In the prevailing situationthe DPRK Government of favorable conditions for the country's peaceful reunification. Its step in this direction are common knowledge. They include proposals for withdrawing all U.S. forces and nuclear weapons from South Korea, replacing the armistice agreement with a peace agreement, and holding tripartite talks between DPRK, South Korean, and U.S. military leaders on the establishment of a Democratic Confederative Republic of Kokyo. In the present complex conditions fraught with the threat of a new armed conflict, special importance is attached also to Pyongyang's recent proposal to transform the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace.

These constructive steps of People's Korea had the support of all the conference participants. They noted in their speeches and in the adopted documents that the package of new soviet initiatives aimed at ending the nuclear arms race, preventing its psread to space, and completely eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and also extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests by the Soviet Union represent an improtant step in support and development of the peace-loving Asian states' initiatives to strengthen trust and mutual understanding between the countries of the Asia and Pacific region of which the Korean peninsula is component part. These initiatives, Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and DPRK president, said, addressing the conference participants, graphically demonstrate the responsible stance and peace-loving policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and to defend peace and security on earth.

The results of the representative international conference which has ended in Pyongyang testify to the growing desire of the peoples of the Asian and other continents to make their contribution to the joint quest for a common comprehensive approach to the formation of security systems and lasting peace on our planet.

Broadcast to China

OW110607 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 10 Sep 86
[Shakov commentary]

[Excerpts] Listeners: We have reported that an international meeting was held in Pyongyang aimed at making the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free, peace zone. The meeting adopted a declaration calling on the United States to remove its military bases in South Korea and withdraw its forces. It opposed the rigging up of a U.S.-Japan-Korea military alliance. Our station commentator Shakov writes:

These demands show the aspirations of nations in the Asia-Pacific region. Militarization of this region is being accelerated every day owing to the U.S. ruling clique's efforts. The United States vainly seeks military superiority in Asia. It has always had military bases in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and other Asian countries; it has deployed nuclear weapons on many of these military bases. The United States has deployed more than 1,000 nuclear warheads in South Korea alone. This is why the call for making the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free zone is particularly urgent. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union has steadfastly supported the desire of people of all countries to make their region a nuclear-free zone. The Soviet Union welcomes the establishment of nuclear-free zones. As you all know, the Soviet Union has proposed that all nuclear weapons be destroyed by the end of this century. Since 6 August 1985, the Soviet Union has unilaterally suspended all nuclear tests. Although Washington has provocatively conducted repeated nuclear tests, the Soviet Union has yet again extended its moratorium until New Year's Day 1987. [passage omitted]

It should be pointed out that the Soviet Union's peace proposal has enjoyed widespread support among the people of all countries in the Asia-Pacific region. They also highly praise China's action. During the Soviet nuclear test moratorium, unlike the Western nations, China has not conducted a single nuclear test. The latest situation shows that the Soviet Union and China still have tremendous latent force to cooperate for peace and the socialist cause for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1580

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

U.S.-SOVIET TALKS RECESS--Geneva, 18 Sep (TASS)--The second round of Soviet-U.S. talks on the whole range of questions concerning nuclear tests has ended here. Wide-ranging discussions were held and a detailed exchange of views took place. At the same time the presence was confirmed of essential divergences between the sides in their approach to the problem under discussion. Speaking to journalists here, the head of the USSR delegation , A.M. Petroysants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Use of Atomic Energy, noted with regret that the U.S. side was not manifesting the necessary flexibility and was, as before, adopting the line of continuing tests rather than halting them with the corresponding monitoring. The delegations intend to meet again in Geneva in November this year. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1042 GMT 18 Sep 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1582

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU OFFICIAL ZAGLADIN ON CONTROL, DISARMAMENT

LD121931 Rome International Service in Italian 1730 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Excerpts] While the controversy over the nuclear issue continues to develop, the government has taken the first steps to take part in the national conference on energy by December as was announced last June at the end of the parliamentary debate following the Chernobyl catastrophe. The agenda for the conference was presented today to Prime Minister Craxi by Industry Minister Zanone, who, together with the minister for relations with parliament, is to consult with the floor-leaders in Parliament next week. The nuclear issue was also mentioned at the L'UNITA festival in Milan where Zagladin, an official of the CPSU Central Committee's foreign department spoke. Here is a report by our correspondent, Caterina Antonangeli:

Zagladin presented himself here with the smiling and cordial appearance imposed by the new Gorbachev line, announcing great plans for the future by the Soviets and an initiative of peace and disarmament which is necessary as a first step toward international detente:

[Begin Zagladin recording in Italian] There is a difference. Everybody talks about control: President Reagan and others, high-ranking officials of the United States--but there is a difference. We talk about the control and verification of disarmament. The United States talks about the control of rearmament. We are for disarmament and absolute control on this process. [end recording]

/8309
CSO: 5200/2767

RELATED ISSUES

BEIJING REVIEW ON SUPERPOWER ARMS RACE

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English Vol 29, No 37, 15 Sep 86 pp 14-15

[Article by Zhou Jirong, Huang Tingwei]

[Text] Since the Soviet Union began to pursue a foreign policy of world domination, the rivalry between the two superpowers for global supremacy and the efforts of other countries to oppose their rivalry have come to be the main features of contemporary international relations. The superpowers are engaged in an intensive arms race with the aim of securing strategic nuclear superiority. This presents a great threat to world peace.

Now that both superpowers possess the capacity to annihilate each other several times over, they need to decide the rules of their endless game of military competition in order to move towards mutual strategic security and to avoid direct military clashes. That is why they have agreed to hold disarmament talks. But the rivalry of the superpowers will, in our view, undergo a long-term evolution. Hence the arms race and the disarmament talks between Moscow and Washington will be with us for a long time to come.

Arms Race: The Dynamics

The arms race has intensified steadily since the end of World War II as both countries have increased their military strength to back up their pursuit of world domination. Although each gives different reasons for its military build-up, both have common motives for engaging in the arms race. It has been clearly shown over the past 40 years that the balance, or imbalance, of military strength represents their relative positions of strength, which in turn determines to a great extent their postures in the struggle for hegemony. Both sides seek to redress the imbalance, each trying to catch up with and overtake the other. Rough military parity and balance of power could preserve the status quo and maintain stability. But the two superpowers do not rest content with mere maintenance of parity. One party inevitably seeks military superiority over the other if its situation at home and abroad improves, especially when it is enjoying a faster rate of economic growth. Then the other party is forced to meet the challenge. As a Chinese saying goes, "a boat goes up when the river rises." Military strategists in the West call this the law of reaction or reflection in the arms race. The Soviet Union and the United States are locked in a vicious circle of action and reaction. Generally speaking, from the end of World War II to the end of the 1960s, it was the US

who set the challenges for the Soviet Union, but in the 1970s the situation was reversed. However, in the 1980s it is again the United States who is setting the pace.

Deep-seated suspicion is another important motive force of the arms race. Both the Soviet Union and the United States accuse each other of posing a grave threat to the other. So both sides have a strong sense of insecurity and claim that they must build up their military strength to safeguard their national security. An independent country has a right to establish its own forces to safeguard the integrity of its territory and its national security. But the term "national security" in the superpowers' vocabulary is taken beyond its proper meaning. Undoubtedly, each considers the other a major threat to itself and uses the threat as the excuse for a huge military budget. For the past few years a monograph called "The Military Strength of the Soviet Union" has been published annually in the US to serve as the grounds for mobilizing domestic public opinion and to press Congress to approve a greater military budget. The concept of national security in the US extends to the whole of the Western hemisphere as a sphere of American influence, in which the US plays the role of protector of allied countries. The US also wants to "protect" vast regions of developing countries. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was at first kept within the bounds of its native territory and Eastern Europe until the mid-1950s. But with the rapid increase in its military strength, and as it became more ambitious, the Soviet Union began to pursue a policy of hegemony, justified by such ideas as those of "the socialist community," "limited sovereignty," and "the natural ally of the non-aligned countries," which served as pretexts for Soviet expansion.

A further motive force of the arms race is the relation, both in the US and the USSR, between science and technology and the defence industry, in which each promotes the other. In the allocation of funds, materials, equipment and experts, priority is given to the defence industry. The development of advanced weapons stimulates the progress of science and technology. In turn, by applying the new achievements of science and technology to the defence industry the arms race is raised to a higher level. Since the 1970s the rapid advance of science and technology has shifted the emphasis from quantity to quality, both sides vying to develop a new generation of strategic offensive weapons with multiple-warheads and intercontinental ballistic missiles of small size, high precision and flexible mobility. The Soviets also started in the late 1950s and the Americans in the 1960s to develop strategic defensive weapons, but progress was slow as the technological barriers were too numerous to break through. The Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme initiated by President Ronald Reagan is the inevitable outcome of the rapid progress of high technology.

New Round of Arms Race

Starting with the early 80's, the arms race between the superpowers has witnessed a shift from a strategy of nuclear offensive to one of both offensive and defensive.

The Reagan Administration has been pursuing a strategy of non-flexible response aimed at meeting the challenge of Soviet military growth. According to the US Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger's annual report to Congress for the fiscal year 1987, "This administration has promoted the search for competitive strategies at every level in our

defence programme. Competitive strategies capitalize on our long-term strengths in ways that exploit Soviet long-term weakness. The hallmark of this Administration's defense programme in the second term will be the search to identify and implement competitive strategies for deterrence." The US SDI programme challenges the Soviet Union to a new round of over-all military competition. The US hopes to be the first country to establish its own strategic defence system and hence render the Soviet offensive strategic weapons obsolete.

Since Mikhail Gorbachev came to power, the Soviet Union has made a reappraisal of its domestic and international positions and has made the necessary adjustments in its foreign policy. It has adopted a so-called "accelerated development strategy" to rebuild the Soviet economy and to close the gap with the United States. Therefore it has decided that the development of its national defence must be subordinated to that of the national economy as a whole. With this in mind Moscow is trying its utmost to prevent the SDI programme from materializing in arms control talks with Washington. However, realizing that the SDI programme is not a bargaining chip, the Soviet Union is now being forced to meet the US challenge. According to the action and reaction formula, the two superpowers will continue to engage in an all-round arms race, but now centred on the struggle for superiority in space.

With regard to the SDI programme, it is thought that certain aspects of it are feasible, as it is based on long-term research into new and sophisticated science and technology. The US government is in a position to finance SDI in its initial stages, and on the political front supporters inside the US outnumber its opponents, while the number of the US's allies opposed to it is decreasing. Progress has already been made on one item of the programme, but there are many technical problems to be overcome if the US is to build an effective defence system that could stand the test of time. Moreover, there still exists a strong force inside the US opposed to the SDI plan. Recently the US Senate issued a report questioning its feasibility. The implementation of the SDI plan would also be prohibitively expensive. It is estimated the research costs will hit 90 billion dollars by the mid-nineties. In its efforts to reach a balanced budget by the 1990s, the US Congress will place many obstacles in the way of SDI.

The Soviet Union is countering the SDI programme by vigorously developing its own defence system. There are over 10,000 Soviet scientists and engineers engaged in research work on sophisticated weapons. The Soviet Union has achieved parity with the United States in particle beam weapons, and in high energy laser weaponry it has the edge, but in advance computer technology it lags behind the United States 10 to 15 years. In the development of a comprehensive space defence system, the US therefore enjoys a definite advantage over the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding all this, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union could build an over-all defence system by the end of the 20th century. Nuclear deterrence will remain effective for a long time to come.

The early nineties will be critical for both the Soviet Union and the United States, when a new generation of nuclear weapons are to replace existing ones. The deployment of US MX, Midgetman and Trident strategic nuclear missiles will be completed by the end of this decade. Without an arms reduction agreement, 572 INF's will be deployed in 1988. On the Soviet side, a fifth generation of ICBM's, SS-24's, SS-25's and a

new type of strategic bomber will be operational. The number of SS-20's will be further increased.

According to a US news report, the Soviet Union is embarking on large-scale nuclear expansion. Without a nuclear limitation agreement, the number of Soviet nuclear warheads could increase from the present 10,000 to 30,000 by the early nineties, and the number of ground-launched missiles from 6,000 to 22,000 by 1995. All this will undoubtedly damage US-Soviet relations and increase political tension between them.

However, for the time being and in the foreseeable future, neither superpower can break the balance of strategic forces and neither dare take the risk of launching war. And more significantly, the forces for peace in the world are growing stronger and stronger, and we are confident that world peace can be won through the concerted efforts of all peace-loving people the world over. ■

/13104
CSO: 5200/4075

RELATED ISSUES

PRC COMMENTARIES ON DISARMAMENT 'STRUGGLE'

International Disarmament Situation

HK120701 Hong Kong LIAOWANG OVERSEAS EDITION in Chinese No 36, 8 Sep 86 pp 26-27

[Article by Li Ginzhen and Li Ginggong: "The Choice Between 'Swords' and 'Plowshares' — Commenting on and Analyzing the Current International Disarmament Situation"]

[Excerpts] In today's world, people are facing this choice: should they continue to build up military forces or beat the swords into a plowshares? Although some people still indulge in arms expansion and war preparations, as a general trend of mankind most people in the world are eager for peace and economic development. The forces demanding reductions in armaments and beating swords into plowshares have been growing and holding back the outbreak of war. The present international disarmament struggle precisely represents this general trend, and has become the main theme of the "International Year of peace."

The present disarmament struggle is mainly reflected in two aspects. First, both the United States and the Soviet Union are trying to contain the opposite side through disarmament negotiations on the basis of their own strength and to build up their own military strength to gain superiority. [passage omitted]

Second, most countries in the world, especially the Third World countries, demand that the superpowers stop their arms race and take the lead in substantially reducing armaments. The East European and West European countries, which are situated in the forefront of the East-West confrontation, feel deeply that the protracted and escalating arms race is directly threatening their security interests, so they demand that the United States and the Soviet Union conclude a disarmament agreement as quickly as possible and substantially reduce their nuclear weapons, ban chemical weapons, and reduce their troops stationed in central Europe. The Third World countries not only are deeply upset by the U.S.-Soviet arms race, but are also worried that the increasing military presence of the United States and the Soviet Union in various regions and the intensifying regional contention between the two superpowers will more seriously threaten their national security and economic development. Therefore, they strongly demand that while reducing their armaments, the United States and the Soviet Union also stop their regional contention and ease regional tensions. Their demand for disarmament is sincere and urgent, and their ardent pursuit of peace and development has formed a strong force which holds back the outbreak of war and maintains peace.

In general, the present disarmament struggle is being carried out through bilateral or multilateral talks with the following main characteristics:

The disarmament proposals are more concrete. This point is obviously reflected in the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks. The two countries are the main participants in the bilateral talks, and they respectively represent the interests of the two major military blocs in the East and West. The strategic purpose of the United States is to check the momentum of the Soviet Union's nuclear arms expansion and to force the Soviets to substantially reduce its strategic nuclear warheads and dismantle its SS-20 missiles deployed in Europe and Asia. Meanwhile, the Reagan administration is trying to create a "peaceloving image" by giving wide publicity to these proposals domestically to consolidate the Republican Party's position in the 1986 midterm elections and the 1988 presidential election. [paragraph continues]

The strategic purpose of the Soviet Union is to get rid of Reagan's "strategic defensive initiative" and to lighten the heavy economic burden caused by the arms race with the United States and to create better conditions for developing its economy. This may enable the Soviets to carry out rivalry with the Americans on a longer-term basis. [passage omitted]

The disarmament struggle has become more internationalized. At present, the European Disarmament Conference, attended by more than 30 countries, and the multilateral disarmament talks in Geneva have attracted attention from more and more people. The nonaligned and neutral countries participating in these talks and China are becoming more and more influential in international affairs, so the multilateral disarmament talks have also achieved a higher status in the world. Although the United States and the Soviet Union impose their bilateral disputes on the multilateral disarmament talks and thus cast an ominous shadow on these talks, most participants still make full use of this arena to expose the deceptive behavior and false disarmament of the two superpowers, to publicize their own opinions, and to exert pressure on the superpowers. As a participant in the Geneva disarmament talks, China clearly declares that she agrees with all-round prohibition and thorough dismantling of nuclear weapons, opposes the arms race in any form, with any content, and in any area, and calls for reducing conventional armaments and chemical weapons. China's principled position has been widely praised and welcomed.

At the present disarmament talks, people's attention is focused on strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate-range nuclear weapons, space weapons, and conventional weapons. People of good will have good desire and always hope that these issues will be solved at an earlier date but reality only makes them worry. [passage omitted]

To sum up, the bilateral disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Union and between the two major military blocs and the multilateral disarmament conference involving many countries are pushed by the forces seeking peace and opposing war and are advancing. All disarmament proposals and actions complying with the general trend of history will be welcomed. However, we must also notice that factors which obstruct the development of disarmament still exist, and the disarmament struggle will be more complicated, arduous, and prolonged. This not only requires the forces for peace in the world make unremitting efforts, but also requires the superpowers to take concrete action to advance disarmament.

Commentary Advocates Conventional Disarmament

OW161040 Beijing in English to North America 0000 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Chen Guang commentary]

[Text] The unprecedented disaster of a nuclear war could wipe out humanity almost instantly, or freeze and starve it into extinction over months of an endless nuclear winter. There is no doubt that nuclear weapons must be reduced and finally eliminated. Destruction by conventional weapons can also be awesome. World War II was a conventional war until the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Deaths and injured still amounted to about 19 million, and the cost of the war, loss of property, and military expenditures topped 5 trillion U.S. dollars.

The conventional weapons now in the hands of the two superpowers are far more powerful than those used in World War II. A cannon's range in the 1940's was 10 km at most, whereas today's artillery can reach four or five times that far. A tactical missile can hit a target as far away as 1,800 km. Accuracy has also taken a quantum leap. Destroying a tank nowadays takes only one or two laser-guided rockets. The destructive power of one salvo from a 12-barrel rocket launcher can equal that of a small nuclear bomb.

Modern weapons have increased the cruelty of conventional war. In the 40 years since World War II 150 local wars and armed conflicts around the world have killed 21 million people, double the number of deaths in World War I and half those in World War II. The Vietnam war alone left 2 million people dead, 20 million wounded, and 17 million homeless. This amounts to one-third of Indochina's total population. Tens of thousands of Afghans have been killed or wounded since the Soviet invasion in 1979. The Soviets have paid a high price for this mayhem. Soviet casualties total perhaps 40,000 deaths and injured, and the financial cost of Moscow's war is estimated at the equivalent of 2 billion U.S. dollars.

Conventional war poses a more realistic threat to the human race than a nuclear one. The frequency of the conventional wars means a risk of staggering death tolls. A conventional war also carries the very real possibility it will escalate into a nuclear war if the two superpowers or other nuclear armed countries become involved. We must reduce nuclear armaments, but we must not ignore the need to do the same to conventional ones. Weapons of all kinds hold peace hostage as long as they exist.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4077-4078

- END -